

*J. A. Jones*

A  
*Modest and True Account*  
OF THE  
**Chief Points**  
IN  
**CONTROVERSY,**  
Between the  
*Roman Catholicks*  
And the  
**PROTESTANTS.**  
TOGETHER

With some Considerations upon the  
SERMONS of a *Divine* of the Church  
of England.

*Drawn* By *N. C. Smyth*

*Corripiet me Justus in Misericordia, &  
increpabit me; Oleum autem Peccatoris  
non impinguet Caput meum, Psal. cxli.*

ANTWERP:

Printed in the Year, 1705.



Model and True Account  
 OF THE  
 Chief Points  
 IN  
 CONTROVERSY  
 Between the  
 Roman Catholics



With some Considerations upon the  
 Reasons of a Division of the Church  
 of England.

By N. C. ...

Considered and ... in ...  
 ...  
 ...

ANTWERP.

Printed in the Year, 1705.

---

---

# THE PREFACE.

**W**Hen first I thought of this Work, my Design was only to answer the most material Objections in Doctor Tillotson's Sermons, without offering any Reasons or Arguments to prove the Tenets which he impugns. But upon Second Thoughts, considering that the weaker, and more ignorant sort of People, for whose Use I chiefly design'd it, might be easily shaken in their Faith, by the specious Arguments of this ingenious Man, and not a little startled at his Pretence to Evidence of Sense and Reason, against the Doctrine of Roman Catholicks; and that perhaps they had not the leisure, nor happily the will, to read over other Controversies, where the said Doctrine is largely prov'd: I judg'd it wou'd contribute more to their Satisfaction, and strengthen them more effectually in their Faith, if I shou'd lay down some of the Grounds on which their Belief is founded, than barely to solve the Objections, and refer them to other Books for the Proof of their Faith: Weak Capacities being commonly loath to take much pains, and what is worse, apt

## The Preface.

to forget what they read in one Place, before they join it to that which they read in another: Whereas a brief Account of their Faith, and some Considerations upon the Objections laid together, wou'd render the Task more easy, and the Satisfaction more full.

But what influenc'd me most to take that Method, was this: A certain Roman Catholick Gentlewoman being very uneasy with her Friends, upon account of Religion, was very much sollicitated by one, to whom she had some special Obligations, to read Doctor Tillotson's Sermons, as the most effectual Means to make her see the Truth of the Protestant Religion, and the Errours of her own: And to engage her the more in the Matter, he read some of the said Sermons to her, and highly commended them; concluding that nothing cou'd be more plain, than that she was very much wanting to her own Interest, if she shou'd refuse to read those Sermons, which (as he said) made out as clear as the Day, that she was in an errour. Which when she told me, and withal added, that she should be glad to have the Scruples, which these Sermons gave her, remov'd, and not a little pleas'd to find that her own Faith was founded in Scripture, and in the Authority of the Primitive Fathers, which it seems, she had not taken pains to inquire into before: I promis'd her to contribute my Endeavours to her Satisfaction in both.

And



## The Preface.

And this in a word, is what chiefly determin'd me to prefix the Proof of each controverted Point to the Doctor's Objections. How well I have succeeded in the Performance, let others judge. This (with many other Defects) I am conscious of, that the Apprehension of being too tedious, has made me contract my Arguments and Reasons, and bring them within a narrower Compass than the Rules of Discourse will well allow of. My Business is to instruct the Weak and Ignorant, not to please the Curious; and therefore, if I have deliver'd my Thoughts plain and easy, I am content. 'Tis the Fate of great Volumes scarce ever to be read all out, at least, by such as most need them; and so, by multiplying of Reasons and Arguments, and dilating upon them, the whole is made useless. Whereas small Treatises, of Two or Three Days Reading, are commonly perus'd by every body, upon this sole Consideration, that if the Advantage be not great, at least the Labour is but little.

For this reason, in quoting the Fathers, I have not multiply'd their Number, nor their Passages to that degree as might otherwise be expected. But to make amends, I took special care to bring no one Passage, to which any Learned Protestant can justly except; being such as the most judicious Critics do acknowledge to be the genuine Works of those Fathers, in whose Names they are quoted. My Passages are, indeed, small



## The Preface.

*in Number, but great in Authority. I judg'd, that Five or Six of the Fathers, the most eminent for Piety and Learning, were sufficient Witnesses of the Faith of their Times, especially when not contradicted by others. These Great Men I look upon as so many Flaming Torches, set up to give light to all future Ages. Their vast Learning and Knowledge in Sciences, especially in the Law of God, is enough to persuade any Man, that they cou'd not be ignorant of any the least Point of their Faith; and their Piety and Zeal for God's Honour, and His Holy Religion, sets them above the Suspicion of even Malice itself, of writing, or teaching, or practising any thing that shou'd appear to be contrary to the Faith and Discipline of the Church; especially, since their Learned Works do still demonstrate how suddenly they were alarm'd at the least Errours, or Innovations in these Matters, and how zealously they wrote against, and branded the Broachers and Promoters of Novelty. So that we may confidently assert, that what these Fathers taught and believ'd, was undoubtedly the Catholick Faith; and pronounce upon the Strength of their Reasons and Authority, though we had no other Arguments to prove it.*

*As to Doctor Tillotson's Sermons, because there are several Editions of them in different Sizes, it will be requisite to let the Reader know what Edition and Size I make use of. I have all that has been hitherto publish'd of them, in Eight Volumes, in a large Octavo; whereof,*

## The Preface:

whereof, the Two First are of the Eighth Edition; the Third, of the Fourth; and all the rest, of the First Edition. But the Three Last being publish'd by Doctor Barker, after the Decease of the Author, are mark'd on the Back, and in the Title Page, First, Second, Third Vol. which in my Citations I point at thus. Vol. I. II. or III. edit. post Obit. to distinguish them from the rest, which are cited without Addition, only that of Volume and Page.

Two things more seem to require I shou'd here speak to, in order to bespeak the Reader's Favour: The First, that it may seem to need some Apology, that in answering the Books of an Archbishop, I do not treat him with that Civility and Respect, that is due to his Person and Character. The Second, that it may seem very hardy and bold for a Roman Catholick to engage in a Controversy, which must needs offend many, especially at this time of day, when the most innocent of our Actions are liable to sinister Constructions: For it seems to carry a Face of Rashness and Presumption to provoke our Superiours, when we know it is in their power to crush and destroy us.

To the First I answer; That I have endeavour'd (as far as the Nature of the Cause wou'd allow it) to keep within the compass of Civility and Respect; and wou'd have given no Man cause to complain, if his Conduct had not (as I conceive) extorted some

## The Preface.

hard Words from me. 'Tis true, no manner of Dispute, or Controversy, can justify a Man's being rude or uncivil; yet, I believe every one will allow, that it is not possible to manage, a Controversy of this nature, and, at the same time, to shew the Respect that might be expected upon other Occasions, without betraying the Cause. I have, indeed, on purpose, forbore to give him any other Title than that of Doctor; because my Dispute with him is not, as he was an Archbishop, but as a Doctor of Divinity; and because I conceiv'd, I might with less Disrespect use the necessary Freedom of Speech under that Notion. However, if any of my Readers will please to do me the favour, to let me know wherein I have unnecessarily exceeded the Limits of due Moderation, I shall take it very kindly, and endeavour to make amends for my Fault.

To the Second; That I never intended to provoke or exasperate any Man, much less wou'd I provoke any of the worthy Members of the Church of England, whom I am in duty bound to honour and respect: And if I wrote any thing that looks that way, 'twas the Necessity of the Subject, not my Inclination, that forc'd me upon it.

My Design was only to lay before those of my own Persuasion, the Truth of that Doctrine, which they and their Ancestours have believ'd since Christianity was planted among them, and which I see now they have  
many



## The Preface.

many Temptations to quit: And in this, I think, I do but follow the Example of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers, who, in the greatest Heat of Persecutions and Fiery Trials (as the Scripture phrases it) took more care than ever, to inculcate to the Christians the Truth of their Religion, and to arm them with the Hopes of a future Life, that they might the better be able to bear up against the Temptations, and Rage of the World, and suffer with joy, as Saint Paul saith, the Pillage and Plunder of their Goods. Rapi-  
nam Bonorum vestrorum cum gaudio suscepistis. However, if I have sinn'd on that hand, I have that confidence in the Equity and Goodness of the Church of England, that my Fault, which is peculiar to my self, will not be requir'd at the hands of those of my Persuasion, whose Consent or Approbation I never desir'd.

I am not ignorant, that our Lives, and fortunes, are at the mercy of the Law; and may be depriv'd of both, when it shall please our Magistrates to put them in execution: But such is their Lenity and Goodness, that they overlook us, and suffer us to live; which we accept always, and in all Places, and with all Thankfulness; and earnestly beseech Almighty God to bless and prosper them for it.

The Better Sort, (which blessed be God, are also the Greater) are sensible, that our only Crime is our Conscience, which we cannot  
help



## The Preface.

help ; and which, I trust in God, we shall ever prefer to all that is most dear to us in this World. They desire our Conversion, because they think us in an Errour ; and we likewise desire, and earnestly pray for theirs, because we are persuaded they are in the wrong. They know we have made no Innovations in Religion, nor broach'd any New Doctrines ; but only stick to, and (to use Saint Paul's Words) hold fast the Profession of that Faith, which we receiv'd from our, and their Ancestours : A Plea which secur'd the very Pagans in the Possession of their Lives and Fortunes, when the Christians got the better of them ; and which, I trust in God, and in the Goodness of our Governours, will ever secure us.

We are not therefore insensible of the Clemency and Good Nature of the worthy Men of the Church of England, nor are we so dull as not to take notice of the Connivance and Liberty they are pleas'd to allow us ; but we think we cannot make them a more suitable Return (a more charitable I am sure we cannot) than to lay before them the dangerous Consequences of their Errours, and the desperate State of their Souls. We see the horrid Sacrileges committed by their Ancestours, and the Schism and Heresy into which they fell ; and we conceive it our Duty to them (who, though they shou'd use us never so ill, are still our Brethren) to mind them of the great danger and hazard they run, in following the Steps of their Forefathers,

## The Preface.

thers, and in persisting in those things, which we conceive are very great Impieties. And if, in handling these Matters, we are forc'd to use such Expressions, as may seem to give offence, 'tis the Necessity of the Subject, not our Inclination, that extorts them from us. Bad things must have bad Names, and Words must bear some proportion with the things they are put to signifie, else they wou'd not give us a just Idea of them: And therefore, in speaking of things, that are confessedly bad, namely Heresy and Schism, if any Expressions, in this Treatise, may seem to shock, or give offence, I hope they will be look'd upon as necessary and unavoidable; and consider'd as Vinegar intended only to cleanse the Wound, but not to vex the Patient, though it shou'd prove uneasy to him; which I call the Great GOD of Heaven. to witness was the Author's Design.

---

The Preface.

There, and in pursuing in these things, which  
we conceive are very great Imperfections, and  
its in handling these Matters, we are bound  
to use such Expressions, as may seem to give  
offence, in the Necessity of the Subject, and  
our intention, that errors shall not arise from us.  
And things must have had Names, and  
Words must bear some proportion with the  
things they are put to signify, else they would  
not give us a just Idea of them: And  
therefore, in speaking of things, that are con-  
fessably bad, namely Heresy and Schism, if  
any Expressions, in which we may seem to  
shock, or give offence, I hope they will be  
look'd upon as necessary, and unavoidable;  
and consider'd as being intended only to  
clear the Word, but not to vex the Fair-  
en, though it should prove uneasy to some;  
which I call the Great GOD of Heaven, is  
witness to the Author's Design.

63 NO 6



A

Modest and True  
**ACCOUNT**  
Of the Chief POINTS in  
CONTROVERSY, &c.

---

*The Introduction.*

---

**I**T is commonly said, and our own Experience teacheth it us, that good Language goes far in gaining Credit to whatever is said ; and that a smooth polish'd Discourse, when Gravely delivered, seems to carry the Face of Truth, though it should happen to be otherwise. Words, when handsomly laid together, have I know not what of Charming in them, and do challenge the Attention of the most obstinate, especially when deliver'd by a Man in a High Station. This, with some other Considerations, moved me to examine the Sermons of Doctor Tillotson, late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury ; to see if the intinsick Value of his

B

Coin



*The-Introduction.*

Can be answerable to the Lustre, and outward Appearance of it.

This ingenious Man has taken a great deal of Pains to convince the World of his Skill in Controversie, and has delivered his Thoughts in such fine smooth Language, that in my Opinion, very few of his Brethren can equal him in the Elegancy of his Stile. We have eight Volumns in 8vo. of his Sermons, in which he seems to have exhausted the Treasure of his Eloquence, in combating the most essential Points Controverted betwixt Catholicks and Protestants; viz. *The Infalibility of the Church, the Pope's Supremacy, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, as he is pleased to call it; *Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images*, (his own words) *Purgatory, and Indulgences*. Tho' this be not the Order, I find he observes in handling these Points, but treats of 'em a little confusedly, as suited best with his Texts; yet, for method Sake, I chose to lay 'em down in this order, being as I suppose, the more Natural to treat of the most material Points, before I come to those that seem to be of less Importance. In the handling then of this important Piece of Controversie, I shall with God's Assistance, observe this Method.

*First*, I will lay down what the Roman Catholicks believe, as of Faith concerning these Points,

*Secondly*, I will prove their Tenets with Reason, Scripture, and Authority of Fathers; tho' of this there should seem little need,

con-

considering that it has been so often already done; were it not that my Business is with the simple and ignorant, whom I would willingly instruct in the Grounds of their own Faith, as well as to caution them against the Subtilties of their Adversaries.

Thirdly, I will answer all the material Objections, which Dr. Tillotson brings against the said Tenets; and do faithfully promise, that where I do not Quote his own words, (for that I cannot always do, by reason they are in many Places very long) I shall not extenuate nor diminish, to the best of my Knowledge, the Force of his Arguments; nor wrest his words to any other Sense, than what they naturally bear in any other Man's Mouth, or Writings.

But before I begin, it will not be amiss to lay down the Foundation on which this Ingenious Man builds his Controversie; a Foundation, indeed, whose Superstructure had it been so true and solid, as it is artificially contrived, would in a great measure justify the Church of *England*, and all other Protestant Separation from their Ancient Brethren, and silence the Roman Catholicks from casting the Imputation of Schism and Heresie upon them. But how far this is from what it seems to be, let the Reader judge when the Mask is taken off.

Dr. Tillotson's Fundamental Principle then is this. " Whatever is plain and evident to  
 " our *Senses* and *Reason*, is to be believed,  
 " tho' all the Churches and Men in the  
 " World should persuade us to the contra-

*The Introduction.*

ry. Thus far, I own he is in the right; but what he infers from thence, namely, that this is the Protestants Case in regard of the Papists, (as he is pleased to call the R. Catholics) requires something more than Herculean Labour to prove it. He owns, indeed, (and that for Reasons well known to the World) that in things doubtful and obscure, every private Man ought to hear the Church, and receive her Interpretation; but in things that are plain and evident, nay as evident, as that twice two make four; I wou'd stand alone, says he, against all the World: His own Words are thus, as I find them in the fifth Volume of his Sermons, pag. 16. " In all matters of Faith  
 " and *Practise*, which are *plain* and *evident*,  
 " either from *Natural Reason*, or from *Di-*  
 " *vine Revelation*, this Resolution seems to  
 " be very reasonable: But in things *doubt-*  
 " *ful*, a modest Man (and every Man hath  
 " Reason to be so) would be apt to be  
 " staggered by the Judgment of a very  
 " Wise Man; and much more of many  
 " such, and especially by the unanimous  
 " Judgment of the Generality of Men.

" But, in things plainly contrary to the  
 " evidence of *Sense* or *Reason*, or the *Word*  
 " of *God*, a Man would complement no  
 " Man, or Number of Men; nor would he  
 " pin his Faith upon any *Church* in the  
 " World; much less upon any single Man,  
 " no not the Pope; no, tho' there were ne-  
 " ver so many probable Arguments brought  
 " for the Proof his *Infallibility*.

" In-



“ In this Case, a Man wou’d be singular,  
 “ and stand alone against the whole World,  
 “ against the Wrath and Rage of a King,  
 “ and all the Terrours of his fiery *Furnace*;  
 “ as in other Matters, a Man wou’d not be-  
 “ lieve all the Learned Men in the World  
 “ against the clear Evidence of *Sense* and  
 “ *Reason*. If all the great *Mathematicians* of  
 “ all Ages, *Archimedes* and *Euclid*, and *Apol-*  
 “ *lonius* and *Diophantus*, &c. could be suppo-  
 “ sed to meet together in a General Council,  
 “ and should there declare in the most so-  
 “ lemn Manner, and give it under their  
 “ Hands and Seals, that twice Two did not  
 “ make Four but Five; this would not  
 “ move me in the least to be of their Mind;  
 “ nay, I who am no *Mathematician*, wou’d  
 “ maintain the contrary, and wou’d persist  
 “ in it, without being in the least startled  
 “ by the positive Opinion of these Learned  
 “ Men; and wou’d most certainly conclude  
 “ that they were either all of them out of  
 “ their Wits, or that they were byassed by  
 “ some *Interest* or other, and swayed a-  
 “ gainst the clear *Evidence* of Truth, and  
 “ the full Conviction of their own Reason  
 “ to make such a Determination as this.  
 “ They might, indeed, over-rule the Point  
 “ by their Authority; but in my inward  
 “ Judgment I should still be where I was be-  
 “ fore.

“ Just so in Matters of *Religion*, if any  
 “ *Church*, tho’ with never so glorious a Pre-  
 “ tence to *Infallibility*, should declare for *Trans-*  
 “ *substantiation*; that is, That the *Bread* and



“ *Wine* in the *Sacraments*, by virtue of the  
 “ Consecration of the Priest, are *Substanti-*  
 “ *ally* changed into the *Natural Body* and  
 “ *Blood* of *Christ*; this is so notoriously con-  
 “ trary both to the *Sense* and *Reason* of Man-  
 “ kind, that a Man would chuse to stand sin-  
 “ gle in the Opposition of it, and laugh at,  
 “ or rather pity the rest of the World, that  
 “ could be so servilely blind, as seemingly  
 “ to conspire in the Belief of so *monstrous* an  
 “ *Absurdity*.

“ And in like manner, if any Church  
 “ should declare that *Images* are to be wor-  
 “ shipped, or that the *Worship* of God is  
 “ to be perform’d in an *unknown Tongue*, and  
 “ that the *Holy Scriptures* which contain the  
 “ Word and Will of God, and teaches  
 “ Men what they are to believe and do in  
 “ order to their *Eternal Salvation*, are to be  
 “ lock’d up and kept conceal’d from the  
 “ People, in a Language which they do  
 “ not understand, lest, if they were per-  
 “ mitted the free Use of them, in their Mo-  
 “ ther Tongue, they should know more of  
 “ the Mind and Will of God, than is conve-  
 “ nient for the Common People to know,  
 “ whose *Devotion* and *Obedience* to the Church  
 “ does chiefly depend upon their *Ignorance*;  
 “ or should declare that the *Sacrifice* of  
 “ *Christ* was not offer’d once for all, but is  
 “ and ought to be repeated ten millions of  
 “ times every Day; and that the People  
 “ ought to receive the Communion in One  
 “ Kind only, and the *Cup* by no means to  
 “ be trusted with them, for fear the pro-  
 “ fane

“ *sane Beards* of the *Laity* should drink of  
 “ it; and that the saving Efficacy of the Sa-  
 “ *craments* doth depend upon the Intention  
 “ of the Priest, without which the *Receiver*  
 “ can have no Benefit by them: These are  
 “ all of them so plainly contrary to *Scripture*,  
 “ and most of them in Reason so ab-  
 “ surd, that the *Authority* of no Church  
 “ whatsoever can oblige a Man to the Be-  
 “ lief of them. Thus far the Doctor.

Here you see, *Christian Reader*, a Great Orator and Divine, teaching from the *Pulpit* and *Prefs*, that *Sense*, *Reason*, and *Scripture*, are all on the *Protestants* side in the aforesaid controverted Points, as clear and evident as that *twice Two make Four*. Here you see him arraign all the *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, *Arch-bishops*, *Bishops*, *Doctors*, *Universities*, and even all *Kings*, *Princes*, *Peers*, *Magistrates*, together with the Common People of all *Countries* and *Provinces* of the *West*, as also the *Greek Church*, and all the *Countries* and *Provinces* in *Communion* with it; all these learned and pious *Christians*, I say, that flourish'd in, and governed this Part of the World, when *Martin Luther* appeared upon the *Theatre*, this worthy Man arraigns for Fools and Madmen: I say, for Fools and Madmen; for all these *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, *Kings*, *Princes*, &c. professed, in those Days, to be guided by their *Senses*, by *Natural Reason*, and by the *Word of God*, contained in the *Holy Scriptures*, and yet all of them believed the very same, concerning the said Points, the *R. Catholicks* do now.

Surely then, they must have been all Fools and Madmen, if *Sense, Reason, and Scripture*, be as *clear and evident* on the *Protestants* side, as that *twice Two make Four*. For, who ever in his Wits deny'd, that *twice Two do make Four*? Or in his right *Senses*, ever affirmed, that White was Black, or Black White? Or that any of our *Senses*, when they are perfect, do not give irrefragable Testimony of their proper Objects? Or that plain and evident Texts of *Scripture* were not to be believed? These monstrous Absurdities the Doctor fastens upon all the eminent and learned Men of the *Eastern and Western Churches*, which flourish'd not only when *Martin Luther* rose up, but also, by his own Acknowledgement, for at least several Ages before him; which is in effect to brand them all with the ignominious Character of Fools and Madmen.

“ If all the great *Mathematicians* of all Ages, saith the Dr. could be supposed to meet together in a General Council, and there declare in the most solemn manner, that *twice Two* did not make *Four* but *Five*, I should most certainly conclude that they were either all of them out of their Wits, or byass'd by some Interest or other. But Good God! What should byass any Man in his Wits, much less any *Society* of Learned Men, to declare against a thing so *clear and evident*? Nothing surely less than *Frenzy or Madness*. But let us hear the Application. “ Just so in Matters of Religion (continues the Dr.) if any Church shou'd declare



“clare for *Transubstantiation*, that is, that  
 “the *Bread and Wine* in the *Sacraments*, by  
 “virtue of the Consecration of the Priest,  
 “are *Substantially* changed into the *Body and*  
 “*Blood of Christ*; this is so notoriously con-  
 “trary both to the *Sense* and *Reason* of Man-  
 “kind, that a Man would chuse to stand sin-  
 “gle in the Opposition, and laugh at, or  
 “rather pity the rest of the World, &c.  
 The Dr. knew very well, and so do all the  
 Learned *Protestants* in the World, that the  
*Latin and Greek Churches*, and all in *Communi-*  
*on* with them, have not only declared for,  
 but have always believed, at least, for several  
 Ages, *Transubstantiation*, as aforesaid: If  
 it be then so notoriously contrary both to  
 the *Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind, as the Dr.  
 would suggest; all those Men, whereof a  
 great Number had, at least, the Reputation  
 of being both Learned and Vertuous, must  
 necessarily have been *all of them out of their*  
*Wits*, or *byassed by some Prejudice*, which  
 most certainly cou’d be nothing else, but  
 the Extremity of Madness and Folly, their  
*Eternal Damnation* being necessarily con-  
 sequent upon such a Belief. He pursues  
 the same Comparison, instancing in the rest  
 of the Controverted Points aforesaid.

But what Man in his right *Senses* would be-  
 lieve, that any one Nation, much less all *Eu-*  
*rope* should conspire to renounce all those  
 means, which God has given them to acquire  
 the Knowledge of things, *viz. Sense, Reason,*  
 and the *Word of God*, without which it is  
 impossible to know any thing: especially in



a Matter which so highly concerns them: Or who wou'd not rather believe, that Dr. *Tillotson* was mightily mistaken, than that the best part of Mankind should make shipwrack of that which alone distinguishes them from Beasts? Nay, who would not rather believe, that either he himself had been out of his Wits? Or that he designed to impose upon Mankind so strange a Paradox, as that Hundreds of Millions of Learned and Ingenious Men should conspire to declare against that, which is both their Everlasting *Interest*, and constitutes them Men? Since neither he nor any Man else, cou'd ever instance in one single Man in his Wits, that ever was guilty of such a Folly.

This, I must confess, is one of the most surprizing, nay the most intolerable Charges, that ever was laid to Mankind; and yet how monstrous and absurd soever it appears, 'tis no less than what was absolutely necessary to support the Cause the Dr. had undertaken. He was, it seems, well read in that famous Dispute betwixt Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Serjeant* concerning *Schism*. The Former wrote a Book in vindication of the Church of England from the Imputation of *Schism*, which the R. *Catholicks* charge her with: The Latter answers his Book in another, intitled, *Schism Disarm'd*: Dr. *Hammond* writes a *Reply* to this, and Mr. *Serjeant* adds a *Rejoinder* to that, which he calls, *Schism Dispatch'd*,

Now to know what relates to our Purpose in this Dispute, you must understand that  
Dr.

Dr. Hammond in the first Chapter of his *Defence of the Church of England*, in his Description of Schism, Paints it in its own horrid and dreadful Shape; as the *Scripture*, and *Holy Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*, had done before him, viz. " That it is Carnality, Self-  
 " condemning, contrary to Charity, be-  
 " reaving one of the Benefit, both of Prayers  
 " and Sacraments; as bad as, and the Foun-  
 " dation of all *Heresies*; that there is scarce  
 " any Crime so great as Schism, not Sacri-  
 " ledge, Idolatry, Paricide, that it is obno-  
 " xious to peculiar Marks of God's Indig-  
 " nation, *Antichristianism*, Worshiping or  
 " Serving the *Devil*, not expiable by Mar-  
 " tyrdom, very hard, if not impossible to  
 " receive such an Injury or Provocation  
 " from the Governours of the Church, as  
 " may make a Separation excusable; impos-  
 " sible, according to St. *Austin*, that there  
 " should be any just Cause for any to separ-  
 " ate from the Church truly *Catholick*.  
 Thus far the Dr. and, indeed, very Right,  
 only where the Fathers condemn him and  
 his Party; he is so much a Friend to his Cause,  
 as to alter the Phrase a little: For Instance,  
 whereas St. *Ireneus* says absolutely, *'It is im-*  
*possible to receive such an Injury or Provocation*  
*from the Governours of the Church, as to make a*  
*Separation excusable*; he saw very well, that if  
 no kind of Injury or Provocation cou'd justi-  
 fie a Separation, himself and his Party stood  
 Condemned in that Holy Father's Opinion;  
 and therefore he changed the Word *Impossi-*  
*ble*, into *very hard, if not impossible*; tho' in the  
 Greek,

Greek, (which some will have to be the Original) or *Latin* Translation, there is not the least Colour for it. So where St. *Austin* saith, *That it is Impossible there should be any just Cause for any to separate from the Catholick Church;* He softens the Expression, changing, *Catholick Church*, into the *Church truly Catholick*; pretending, if I may presume to Spell his Meaning, that they did not separate from the *Church truly Catholick*, tho' they had separated from all other Societies and Congregations in the World; upon a ridiculous Pretence, as if the *Catholick Church* and the *Church truly Catholick* were Two different things; or where the Expression seems too Harsh, he thinks himself sufficiently entituled to moderate it; as, where the Holy Father St. *Austin* says, *There is no Crime so great as Schism*; he makes bold with his Words rendring them thus; *There is scarce any Crime so great as Schism.*

Mr. *Serjeant*, to whose great *Wit*, and indefatigable Labour we are obliged for several other Learned and Ingenious Works in these two excellent *Treatises*, presses his *Antagonist* to purge himself and his Party of the Guilt of *Schism*; since he owns they had made a Separation from that Church, in whose Communion they, and their *Ancesters* were, since they imbraced the *Christian Faith*. But among other pressing *Arguments*, he urges this, which in my Opinion is enough to open any Man's Eyes that has not sworn never to see the Sun. Dr. *Hammond* gathers from *Fathers* and *Scriptures*, that *Schism* is so horrid a Sin, that " There is scarce any  
" Crime



“ Crime (I give you his own Words) so  
 “ great, not Sacrilege, Idolatry, Parricide;  
 “ not expiable by Martyrdom; very hard, if  
 “ not impossible to receive such an Injury or  
 “ Provocation from the Church, as may  
 “ make a Separation excuseable. Impossible  
 “ according to St. *Augustine*, that there  
 “ shou’d be any just Cause for any to separ-  
 “ ate from the Church truly *Catholick*.  
 Whence Mr. *Serjeant* Reasons thus: No Man  
 in his Wits, much less any Body of Learned  
 Men ought to separate from the Church, or  
 withdraw themselves from its Authority,  
 unless they had a clear and evident Convicti-  
 on, both that this Separation was absolutely  
 Necessary, and that the Authority pretended  
 by the Church, was a manifest Usurpation;  
 because they would else incur that horrid  
 Guilt of Schism: But, Dr. *Hammond* and his  
 Party are so far from having any such Evi-  
 dence or Conviction for either the one or  
 ther other, that nothing is pretended but  
 bare Probabilities and Conjectures: Conse-  
 quently, it is the last of Madness and Folly in  
 Dr. *Hammond* and his Party to persist in their  
 Separation. Now, Dr. *Tilletson*, who was a  
 very acute Man, foreseeing what Effect so  
 plain a Demonstration was like to have upon  
 such as tendered the Salvation of their Souls;  
 being however resolved to maintain the Cause  
 at any rate, cou’d bethink himself of nothing  
 sufficient to justify so dangerous a Separation,  
 less than a clear and evident Demonstration  
 of the Necessity of it. And this, in my Opi-  
 nion, was the Reason why he undertook to  
 demonstrate



demonstrate that, in regard of the aforesaid controverted Points, the common Sense of Mankind, natural Reason, and the Scripture, were as clear and evident on the *Protestants* Side, as that *twice two make four*. But what if I shew that he is so far from having any such *Evidence* on his side, that there is not one of all these Points in which he Instances, but what is destitute of even the least propable Argument to support it? Nay, I go farther, what if I demonstrate that the *R. Catholicks* have all the *Evidence* and *Reason* that the Nature of such things will bear, for what they hold concerning these Points? Then surely I may reasonably hope, that Rational Men, who ought to tender the Welfare of their Immortal Souls, will be so just to themselves, as seriously to consider, into what horrible and dangerous Crimes they are drawn by the wilfulness of Men, who are resolved to maintain a Separation, which all the World knows, was begun for no other End than to countenance things that I am unwilling to Name, but are too well known to be Concealed.

This I shall endeavour, by the Assistance of God's Grace, to perform in the following Chapters; when I have first laid down that chief and fundamental Point of all Controversies, namely the *Infallibility* of the Church.

---

CHAP. I.

*Of the Infallibility of the Church.*

THE *R. Catholicks* hold, That the Church is Infallible, that is, cannot Err in delivering the

the Doctrine She received from Jesus Christ, nor mistake in Her Explanation thereof, when by Hereticks wrested and perverted to a wrong Sense.

The Ground of which Tenet I conceive to be this; that *Christ* has provided such efficacious Means for the Conveyance of Truth to all succeeding Ages, as will infallibly secure the Church from Errour in her Decrees concerning Articles of Faith.

This Point is to be managed with so much the more Perspicuity and Clearness, by how much it is of greater Importance than any other: It will be therefore requisite to take some Pains to satisfy Mens Reasons, and, if it be possible to make this Truth so *Clear* and *Evident*, that those whose Interest and Prejudices make them unwilling to own it, may, at least, be Ashamed to deny it: And methinks I have this peculiar Advantage in this undertaking, that every Pious *Christian*, who tends the Welfare of his Soul, cannot chuse but wish me Success; because I undertake the Proof of that which it is every Man's Interest, it shou'd be True; for, if I can shew that there is an *Infallible Church*, and that such a Congregation of Faithful is that Church, then all *Christians*, who are Sollicitous about the true Church, and the Means of Salvation, and Agitated with various Scruples and Difficulties; and which is more Dreadful, threatned with *Hell* and Damnation by the furious Zeal of different Parties, may sit still, and hear what the *Infallible Church* says to them. In the Handling then of this important Truth, I shall do these three Things.

First,

## The Infallibility

First, *I will endeavour to shew, that there is a Church, or Congregation of Faithful which is Infallible in her Decisions and Declarations of all Articles of Faith.*

Secondly, *That this Congregation, and no other, is that which is in Communion with the Bishop of Rome.*

Thirdly, *I shall Answer the Objections which Dr. Tillotson brings in his Sermons against this Point.*

First, *I will Endeavour to shew, that there is a Church, or Congregation of Faithful which is Infallible in her Decisions and Declarations of all Articles of Faith.* To prove this, I shall lay down these Grounds.

1. That *Jesus Christ* planted His Doctrine in the Hearts of a certain Number of Men, by working True and Real Miracles in their Presence, which no other but an Omnipotent Power cou'd Effect; and that in Order to the Propagating this Doctrine, he chose Twelve Men, whom he called Apostles, and made them His chief Ministers, vesting in them His own Power and Authority for that End.

2. That these Twelve Apostles, and other Disciples went into several Countries, and Preached the same Doctrine to *Jews* and *Gentiles*, confirming it with true and real Miracles.

3. That the Apostles Ordained and Constituted other Ministers of this Doctrine to succeed in their own Room, to whom they delegated the same Power they received from *Jesus Christ*; and these, Others; and so on from Generation to Generation, to continue to the End of the World.



4. That this Power of working Miracles continued in the Preachers of this Doctrine, at least, till a considerable Number of People had embraced the same Doctrine in most of the then known Countries of *Asia, Europe,* and *Africa*: This supposd I say,

1. That the People who heard the Apostles preach, and saw them confirm their Doctrine with true and real Miracles, were infallibly sure, that this Doctrine was True; because they were sure the doing of such Miracles required an Omnipotent Power, and that, according to the Notion all Men naturally have of God, He would not exert His Omnipotence in Favour of a Lye.

2. That, whatever Articles the Universal Consent of so many Nations was agreed upon to have been received from the Apostles, it is impossible it should be False, that they had received them; because it is impossible that so many Nations of different Interests, Tongues and Manners, should all Conspire and Agree to relate the same thing, as received from the Apostles, if it had not been so. And as this is most assuredly True in regard of those, who saw the Miracles of the Apostles, and delivered their Doctrine to the next Generation; so it is, for the same Reason, equally impossible it should be False in respect of any succeeding Generation.

That there was such a Man in *England*, as King *Henry the VIII.* or that there is, or was, such a Man as the *Grand Signior*, or such a City as *Constantinople*; I am as certainly sure, as of any thing I see with my Eyes; for, it is



### *The Infalibility*

as Evident to my Understanding, that it is impossible in Practice, that so many Nations, (as relate these things) different in their Humours, Manners and Interests, should all conspire to tell an Untruth, which can be of no Advantage to them, as it is Evident to my Senses, that I see the Paper, and feel the Pen wherewith I Write. For, since no Cause imaginable can be Assigned, to cause so many different Nations to conspire together in the Belief of an Untruth, (no Interest, as we suppose, moving them thereunto) and no Cause put, it is impossible an Effect should follow, it is as evident to my Reason that they cannot thus Conspire, as it is to my Senses, that I perceive their proper Objects; unless we have recourse to God Almighty, and say, that He might put it in their Hearts to act thus: But if we should suppose this not inconsistent with His Divine Attributes; may we not likewise suppose that He might impose upon my Senses, and make me think I see and feel when I do not? Yes undoubted: Yet, I suppose, no Body will say, but that I may be certainly sure, that I both see and feel. And whatever reason His unsearchable Wisdom might have to impose upon my Senses, I am sure it does not stand with His Goodness to put into any Man's Heart to tell a Lye. If it be then impossible, that the universal Consent of all the Nations in *Europe*, should be liable to Err in delivering to Posterity things of an indifferent Nature; how much more must the universal Consent of all the *Christian* World be certain in Conveying the Truth

Truth of the Gospel upon which our *Eternal* Welfare depends.

One single Man may, and has often declared the Truths that were committed to him; but because he is obnoxious to *Errour*, no Man is bound to believe him any further than he shews good *Credentials* for what he says. It was therefore necessary the Apostles and other Disciples, who first preached the Gospel, each apart, should be endued with a Power of working Miracles to gain themselves Credit. A small Body of Men, such as a City or Corporation, is less obnoxious to *Errour* than One Man; however, no Man is obliged to believe them, no further than they shew good Reason for what they say; because it is easy for such a Body of Men, for some private End, to conspire in the Belief of an *Untruth*. Thus in some time after the *Flood*, the Sons of *Cham* erected Idols, and persuaded the rest of their Kindred (Men simple indeed, but very much abandoned by God) that these were the Gods they must adore. And for all this false Worship prevailed in succeeding Ages, as Men increased, so as to spread almost over the whole *Earth*; yet because it was not only destitute of all rational Motives to persuade its Belief in the Beginning, but even contrary to the Light of Nature, the very Philosophers and Learned Men, that seem'd to promote its Profession, gave no credit to it. Thus a small Number of *Saracens* persuaded the rest of their rude and barbarous Countrymen to believe the Impostures of *Mahomet*. And however this

### The Infallibility

barbarous Nation forced their Passage with Fire and Sword thro' many spacious Countries, and planted their Religion in most Parts of *Asia* and *Africa*. Tho' their Principles be not altogether so absurd as those of the *Pagans*, yet as they have not the least rational Motive to induce any Man to believe them; so neither were they obtruded on the Believers (the Progeny of those who first embraced them excepted) by any other Means than Cruelty and Slaughter. I have on purpose mentioned these Two false Religions that swayed in the World for a long time, to obviate an Objection which might be made against the unanimous Consent of *Christians* in their Belief of the Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*. For, if it be said, that several Countries and Nations of *Pagans* and *Mahometans* have conspired in the Belief of the Faith they received from their Ancestours, yet that this Faith or Religion was false: This Objection is so far from impairing the Truth of the *Christian Religion*, that it rather confirms it: For it is most certain the *Pagans* and *Mahometans* received their Religion from their Ancestours, and these from others, and that the Mistake did not consist in this, but because they were so foolish as to receive it from those who took it up in the Beginning, without any rational Motive, nay contrary to Sense and Reason, and the very Light of Nature. The Case was very different with the *First Christians*: They embraced their Religion upon a clear and evident Conviction of their Senses and Understanding, viz.

Upon



Upon the *Evidence* of true and real Miracles, and other corroborating Proofs: But of this enough.

A whole Nation is much less subject to err, in conveying Truths received to Posterity, than a City, or small Body of People: And tho' it be not impossible they should all agree together, to deliver to Posterity what they had not received from their Ancestours, yet it is hardly credible they would. That there happen'd a great Conflagration in *London* in the Year 66, we have no other Evidence but the Testimony of the People of *England*; yet, whoever should deny that Fact, would be look'd upon as a Fool, or a Madman. If it be then so incredible, that One Nation, who speak all the same Language, and have daily Intercourse one with another, should be so disingenuous as to deliver to their Posterity, as a Truth received from their Ancestours, what they had not received; how should it ever sink into the Heart of any Man in his Wits, to believe that Hundreds of Nations of different Humours, Tongues, Customs, and Interests, should unanimously agree together to do that, which is so incredible of One single Nation? This indeed is plainly impossible, unless we can suppose, that so many Nations should meet together, or communicate their Thoughts to one another by Writing, and so all agree to tell what they knew not, to the Prejudice of Truth, and their own and Posterities *Eternal Damnation*, than which nothing on *Earth* is more absurd: Or that God should put it into

### The Infallibility

their Hearts to deceive their Posterity; which, even to imagine, is horrid Impiety.

The Sum of all that I have said is this, That it is impossible the universal Consent of the Pastors and People of so many different Nations, should concur and agree in declaring any Article or Articles of Faith, unless they had received the same Articles from their Ancestors; and it is equally impossible that these Ancestors should have so delivered them, unless they *had* received them from their Ancestors, and these from others *their* Ancestors, and so up till you come to the First People who took up these Articles: And if it be found, that these People had *evident Conviction* of the Truth of these Articles, such as true and real Miracles, it is equal to a Demonstration that the same Articles are true; because (as 'tis said before) the Working of real Miracles requires an Omnipotent Power; and the Light of Nature shews us, that God would not put His Seal to an Untruth. And if it be asked, how come we to be certainly sure, that the Apostles confirmed their Doctrine with Miracles? I answer, Because it is impossible that all the Nations to whom the Apostles and their Disciples preached the said Articles of Faith, should all agree to deliver to Posterity, that they had received such Articles upon a *clear Conviction* of their *Senses* and *Reason* by true Miracles, unless it were true that they had so received them. And this is an Advantage whereof all Hereticks are destitute; no *Sect* that ever yet sprung up in the Church, being

ing able to derive its Heretical Opinions from the Apostles, or First Planters of the *Christian Faith*; but have all a certain Period, beyond which they cannot ascend to derive their Doctrine. To instance in some: The *Arians* for near 200 Years might claim the general Consent of *some Nations*, asserting they had received their Doctrine from their Ancestors; but when they went back as far as the Beginning of the Fourth Century, all their Ancestors are reduced to miserable *Arius* who at that time, contrary to the unanimous Consent of the whole *Christian World*, deny'd the Divinity of the *Son of God*.

In like manner, the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* may pretend to a general Consent of some Nations, for a great many Ages; but when they ascend as far as the latter End of the 4th, and the Beginning of the 5th Century, they are forced to stop there, and reduce their Ancestors, the 1st to *Nestorius*; the 2d to *Eutiches*, a Monk, and *Dioscorus*, Bishop of *Alexandria*. The *Waldenses* likewise may say for themselves something like the rest; but if we look back as far as the 12th Century, we shall find them all terminate in One single Merchant of *Lyons* in *France*, *Peter de Waldo*. And to come nearer home, those many, and almost innumerable Sects in our own and Neighbour Countries, who go by the general Name of *Protestants*, tho' they pretend to have received their Doctrine from their Ancestors for some time; I hope they will not say (and indeed to do them justice, I never heard they pretended to



it) that those Opinions they hold in opposition to the *R. Catholicks*, were delivered to them by their Ancestors, any higher up, than the Beginning of the 16th Century; when, 'tis no less manifest, that all their Ancestors were *R. Catholicks*, than that *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, and *Calvin*, were the Inventors of their New Opinions.

Here, perhaps, it will be objected, That this Consent of Nations, for all the Articles of the *Catholick Faith*, is not so universal as I pretend, since, 'tis well known, a great many, in almost all Ages, have contradicted it: The *Arians*, for Instance (to omit many other *Sects* before them) contradicted it in One Point; the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians* in Two; the *Waldenses* in more, and the *Protestants* in most of all.

This is the only Objection which can, with any Colour of Reason, be made against the universal Consent of the *Ca. Church*, and which, doubtless, occasioned the Ruin of many Souls; most of those People, that followed these Ring-leaders, being either unable to examine the Grounds of their Separation, or prejudiced by some Temporal Consideration, in favour of their Opinions: And withal thinking themselves secure in the Society and Communion of so many Men, whom they look'd upon to be both Learned and Godly.

Now if I can make out, that this Objection is not only weak, but even void of all Colour of Reason, I hope our deluded Friends will be so just to their own Souls, as to consider how dangerous it is to persist in a Separation

paration which is necessarily attended with the unavoidable Crime of *Schism*, so dreadfully described by one of their own Learned \* Men. Which that I may the more distinctly do, I desire these 4 things may be considered.

\* Doctor  
Hammond.

I. That the Contradiction of each of the said Sects began first in One or Two at most.

II. That the Contradiction of all such as adher'd to the Heads of each Sect, be they never so many, amounts to no more than that of those One or Two who first oppos'd it.

III. That these Authors of Sects did not all oppose this universal Consent at the same time; but some in different Ages, and all at different Times.

IV. That they did not all oppose the same Points of Faith.

1. That the Contradiction of each of the said Sects began first in One or Two at most. This is so manifest in History, and in all Records both Ancient and Modern, that it were superfluous to go about to prove it.

2. That the Contradiction of all such as adher'd to the Heads of each Sect, be they never so many, amounts to no more than that of those One or Two, who first oppos'd it. This is evident; for, if *Arius*, for Instance, err'd in denying the *Consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father, no Number of Adherents to his Opinion can make it true. Now that *Arius* err'd in this Point, 'tis easy to see, because the universal Consent of the whole Christian World was against him. And as this is manifest in respect of *Arius* and his Sectators, so it is no less convincing in regard of *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, and all other Sects whatsoever. 3.

### The Infallibility.

3. *These Authors of Sects did not oppose the universal Consent at the same time ; but some in different Ages, and all at different Times :* This is so plain, that it needs no Proof; for no body, who is never so little read in Antiquity, can be ignorant, that *Arius*, for Instance, opposed it in the Beginning of the 4th Age; *Nestorius* in the Beginning of the 5th Age; *Eutyches* in some Years after; and so of all the rest.

4. *They did not all oppose the same Points of Faith.* This is no less evident than the former, our Adversaries themselves being the Judges: Indeed, if they had all deny'd the same Articles of Faith, at the same time, and in different Parts of the World; I must confess, it would in some measure lessen the Authority of those that asserted them; for it is natural to think, that several Men, of different Tongues and Interests, would, without any mutual Participation of their Thoughts, never agree to assert or deny the same things, unless there had been some Reason for it. But when one Man denies One Point or more, if you please, in one Age, and another denies another, in another Age, or, at least, at a different time; what is this, but One Man against all the World? To answer this Objection then, I say,

1. That tho' it were true that all these Heads of Sects had always opposed the universal Consent of the Church as aforesaid, *viz.* One in one Age, and another in another, or at a different time; this Opposition can no more prejudice the Faith, which we hold



hold upon the universal Consent of all the *Christian* World, than if one Man, in the Last Age, and another in this, had deny'd the Being at any time of K. *Henry the VIII.* or of the City of *Constantinople*, such Impudence could lessen our Belief concerning that King, or this City.

2. 'Tis not true, that these Heads, or Ring-leaders of Sects, did always oppose the universal Consent of the Church: For, since they were the First, as I shall prove by and by, that opposed the Doctrine of the Church, and taught New Opinions contrary to what was believed before; they must have been, for some time before they broached their New Doctrine, of the same Opinion with the rest of the Church, who taught them their Faith; consequently they did not always oppose the universal Consent, but concurred with the rest in it, till they took up their New Opinions; and even still continue to own, that the Doctrine which they opposed, was universally believed at the time of their Separation. So that we have the universal Consent of the *Christian* World, for the Truth of our Faith; even the Consent of those who afterwards opposed it, not excepted.

Now that these Heads, or Ring-leaders of Sects, to wit, *Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Luther*, &c. were the First that opposed the universal Consent of the Church, in respect of the several Opinions wherein they are said to contradict it, may easily be proved; *First*, By the Confession of their own Parties, who ingeniously own that they follow the Opinions

pinions of those Men in the things wherein they differ'd from the rest of the World; and have therefore got the Appellation of *Arians, Nestorians, Eutycheans, Lutherans, &c.*, whereas, if any *Churches*, or Societies of *Christians* had held these Opinions before, they wou'd have continued in Communion with them, and not have separated from all the World, as 'tis manifest they have, even by the Acknowledgement of their own Writers. 2dly, By an Induction of all these *Sects* in particular, and of the *Councils* held in several Ages, wherein they were proscribed: But in this I am happily prevented, by the ingenious Confession Dr. Tillotson was pleased to make of this Truth, as far, at least, as

Ser. I. relates to my Purpose. " Thus (says he) in  
Vol. V. " the Heighth of *Popery, Wickliff* appear'd  
" here in *England*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* and  
" *John Hufs* in *Germany* and *Bohemia*. And in  
" the Beginning of the *Reformation*, when  
" *Popery* had quite over-run the Western  
" Parts of the World, and subdued her E-  
" nemies on every side, and *Antichrist* sat se-  
" curely in the quiet Possession of his King-  
" dom, *Luther* arose, a bold and rough Man,  
" but a fit *Wedge* to cleave in sunder so hard  
" and knotty Block, and appeared stoutly  
" against the gross Errours and Corrupti-  
" ons of the *Church of Rome*; and for a  
" long time stood alone, and with a most  
" invincible Spirit and Courage maintained  
" his Ground, and resisted the united Ma-  
" lice and Force of *Antichrist* and his Adhe-  
" rents; and gave him so terrible a Blow,  
" that

“ that he is not yet perfectly healed and recovered of it. So that for a Man to stand alone, or with a very few adhering to him, and standing by him, is not a meer imaginary Supposition, but a Case that hath really and in Fact happen’d in several Ages and Places of the World. Thus he; and indeed enough to prove what I said: For you see, he ingeniously owns, these Authors of Sects stood alone each in his Time; and he might as well have said the same thing of the Authors of all other Sects that ever rose in the Church. “ *Wickliff*, says he, appeared here in *England*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, and *John Hufs* (Two of *Wickliff*’s Disciples) in *Germany* and *Bohemia*. There was none then of their Opinion before them; *Luther* stood alone for a long time; all the World was then against him. And must this single Man be believed upon his bare Word, delivering a New Doctrine in opposition to all the World, without the least Mark or Character of a Man sent by God? These are surely harder Terms than God ever required of the very *Pagans* for their Conversion from Idolatry. But to give this more weight, let us compare the *Jews* which received the Law and the Prophets, with the *Christians* who received the Gospel.

Tho’ the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* were notoriously known to be very wicked, and had enjoined the *Jews* the Observance of some Traditions of their *Fathers*, together with the Law of *Moses*; yet *Christ* was so far from advising the *Jews* to separate from them, that  
He



Mat.  
xxiii. 2.

John xv.  
24.

He expressely commanded them, *To observe and do whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees bid them*: And that, because *They sat in the Chair of Moses*: Nay, what is more, He says, *If I had not done among them the Works, which none other Man did, they had not had Sin*: Intimating that it was neither *reasonable* to depart from that *Religion* which they received from their *Ancestors*, the Truth whereof was at several times confirm'd by true and real Miracles, nor *sinful* not to hear His Doctrine to the prejudice of their own, unless He had done greater Works, that is, had wrought greater Miracles in confirmation of the Truth of it, than any Man before had done in confirmation of theirs. And shall the *Catholick Religion*, the *Religion of Jesus Christ*, which is grounded upon surer and better Promises than that of the *Jews*, even upon the Promise of that Word which abideth for ever; shall this Religion, I say, be abandon'd at a Signal given by One single Man, rising up in opposition to all the World, without a Sign or Miracle, or the least reasonable Pretence to it? Surely this is so monstrously absurd, that were we not convinced of the Truth of it, by our own woful Experience, we shou'd rather believe, the whole Frame of Nature would dissolve, and all things run counter to their usual Course, than that any Man in his Wits shou'd be guilty of such a Folly; *Obstupefcite Cæli super hoc!* That One profligate Monk, who, as all the World knows, debauched a Professed Nun, whom he kept till his Death, contrary to his and her

her solemn Vows of Chastity, and, for ought that ever I could hear or learn, never shew'd any Marks of Repentance for this his incestuous and criminal Commerce: That this wretched Man, I say, without the least Mark or Character of a Divine Commission, on the contrary, that was branded with all the Marks wherewith *Christ* and his Apostles point us out the Ministers of *Satan*, shou'd prevail upon the Credulity of so many Great, and, in other Matters, Wise, and Learned Men, is surely so surprizing, that nothing in Nature can parallel it.

But did the first Authors of the *Reformation* work no Miracles? As for true Miracles, I do not find they did any; but something like Miracles, or rather surprizing Wonders, I find recorded by their own *Writers*: But the Mischief on't is, they are such as overthrow the whole *Reformation*, if they were believed.

*Luther* tells us in his Book *De Missa angulari*, That what he wrote against the Mass, was suggested to him by the Devil. This Book was printed and published by his own Reformed Doctors of *Wittenberg*; but because it looks now something scandalous to Pious Reformed Ears, it must pass for an Impostor. *Bolsec*, a Protestant Writer, tells us, That *Calvin* agreed to give a certain Man named *Bruleus*, a Sum of Money, on condition he wou'd feign himself dead, that he might come to resuscitate him; and when all things were prepared for this Farce, the New Apostle had no sooner commanded the Living to rise, when his Words had that strange Efficacy as to

to strike him dead; but *Bruleus* his poor Wife, who lost both her Husband and the Hopes of her Money, reviled the Apostle, and discovered the Impostor: But this is still so offensive to the *Reformation*, that it is meet it shou'd likewise pass for a Fable. But to return.

“ *Luther* arose, faith the Dr. and appear'd  
 “ stoutly against the gross Errours and Cor-  
 “ ruptions of the *Church of Rome*— and re-  
 “ sisted the united Malice and Force of *Anti-*  
 “ *christ* and his Adherents. And what are  
 these gross Errours and Corruptions of the  
*Church of Rome*? Even that Faith which was  
 preach'd to his Ancestors at their first Con-  
 version to *Christianity*, as the best of his own  
*Protestant Writers* do confess; the Truth  
 whereof was confirm'd, not by Impostors,  
 but by true Miracles, as *Venerable Bede*, and  
 all the Historians of those Times, do wit-  
 ness. As to his *Unchristian* Railing in this  
 Place, I will say nothing to it, but leave him  
 to his own Master to account for it. And  
 indeed, if Railing were the Subject of our  
 Dispute, I wou'd freely yield him the Palm,  
 for I own I have no Talent that way.

You see then, *Christian* Reader, upon how  
 fickle and sandy a Bottom the Faith of all  
*Sectaries* stands, and how firm and solid that  
*Basis* and Foundation are, whereon the *Ca-*  
*tholick Faith* is built, namely the universal  
 Consent of all the *Christian* World, which,  
 if liable to Errour, we may justly doubt of  
 the Truth of any thing in the World, even  
 of what we see with our Eyes; since, as 'tis  
 already



already prov'd, it is as impossible, that the universal Consent of so many Nations shou'd conspire to declare, they had received that Faith from their Ancestors, if they had not, as that a Wall, for Example, shou'd not be White, when I see it to be so.

Here, I foresee, it will be objected, That *clear Evidence* destroys the Virtue of Faith, which is essentially obscure, as Saint Gregory saith, *Nec Fides habet Meritum, cui Ratio Humana præbet Experimentum*: Nor hath that Belief any Merit, to which Humane Reason gives Experience. But this is easily answer'd, viz. That the Obscurity of Faith is well consistent with Evidence, that the Faith was reveal'd, though not with the Evidence of the thing reveal'd by Faith; that is, One may have Evidence of the Existence of a thing, tho' his Reason can neither understand, nor comprehend the thing it self; else the Apostles must have been in worse Circumstances than any other Christian; for having seen with their Eyes, and felt with their Hands, as St. John saith, most of the Mysteries of our Redemption, they had the Evidence of their Senses for the Truth of their Existence, consequently, cou'd have no Faith concerning them, if there be any Force in this Objection. This Answer is agreeable to the Definition St Paul gives of Faith, viz. That it is an Evidence of things not seen; *Fides est sperandarum Substantia rerum, Argumentum non apparentium*; Faith is the Substance of things hoped for, the Evidence of things not seen; that is, grounded upon the Evidence

Epist. i.  
chap. i.

of things not seen, nor understood. And thus St. Gregory's Words are to be understood ; for he comments upon these Words of St. John, Cap. xx. *When the Doors were shut, where the Disciples were assembled for fear of Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst. Quomodo* (saith he) *post Resurrectionem, Corpus Dominicum verum fuit, quod clausis Januis ingredi potuit ? Sed sciendum nobis est, quod Divina Operatio, si Ratione comprehenditur, non est Admirabilis, nec Fides habet Meritum, cui Ratio Humana præbet Experimentum. How was the Lord's Body, after the Resurrection, a True Body, that cou'd enter (the House) when the Doors were shut ? But we must understand, that, if the Work of God be comprehended by Reason, it is not Wonderful ; Nor hath that Belief any Merit, to which Humane Reason gives Experience. The Disciples saw Christ's Body, and felt It with their Hands, consequently had Evidence of Two of their Senses : Yet, according to St. Gregory, they cou'd have Faith concerning the Truth of His Body, only, because they did not comprehend, how it was possible for it to enter the House when the Doors were shut.*

In like manner, tho' we have Evidence of Reason, that the things we believe were revealed by Jesus Christ, yet the Reward of our Faith is nothing diminish'd because we believe such things as we neither comprehend nor understand. And, indeed, whoever seriously considers the Great Work of our Redemption, he cannot but think, that it was most agreeable to the Infinite Wisdom and Goodness

Goodness of our Divine Redeemer to leave us this *Evidence*. *Jesus Christ* came to the World, declar'd to a select Number of Men, such high and mysterious things, as seem to shock Humane Reason; laid down His Life for the Salvation of Mankind; sent His Apostles to publish these Mysteries over all the World; and threaten'd with *Eternal Damnation*, all those, who wou'd not believe them; and that not only for a Time, but also unto the End of the World. Is it not then very reasonable, that this mysterious Doctrine should always be attended with such Characters and Credentials of Truth, as may convince the most obstinate Gainsayers of it, which, I am sure, nothing less than either *Evidence of Sense*, or *Reason* can effect: For, if the *Evidence* be less, then the Doctrine is only probable; and if it be only probable, one may reasonably doubt of the Truth of it; and if the Truth of it may be reasonably doubted, the contrary, for ought any one knows, may be true; and if the contrary may be true, I am sure, it does not stand with God's Goodness to condemn any Body to *Eternal Flames*, for not believing a Doctrine, the contrary to which, for any thing that he doth, or can know may be true.

Here I wou'd not be understood so as to mean, that none can have true *Faith* without *clear Evidence*; for 'tis plain, that the most part of Mankind are taught the Articles of their *Faith* by their Parents or Pastors, whose Testimony is confessedly fallible; nor do I pretend, that this is a rigorous Demon-



stration, such as *Mathematicians* make, nor yet an *Evidence of Sense*; but this I say, that the universal Consent of so many Nations, as compose the *Catholick Church*, conspiring in the Belief of such Articles of *Faith*, make it as evident to my *Reason*, that the said Articles of *Faith* are true, as any *Evidence of Sense*, or Demonstration cou'd make them, if they were capable of any. In a word, the Apostles and their Disciples deliver'd the *Christian Faith* to several Nations, and convinc'd their *Senses* and *Reason* of the Truth of it, by true and real Miracles; and the universal Consent of the same Nations, which succeeded the *Evidence of Miracles*, is equally convincing to us, that that *Faith* is certainly true; consequently we have a certain, and an undoubted Motive to rely upon, in the Belief of the Articles of our *Faith*.

Now it is manifest, and even acknowledg'd by our Adversaries, that, excepting those who separated themselves, or were cut off from the Church by Excommunication, for their obstinate Adherence to some Errours contrary to *Faith*; and whose Opposition cannot prejudice the Truth of that *Faith*, as I prov'd before; that *excepting those*, I say, the universal Consent of all the *Christian World* agrees in all the Articles of *Faith*, that the *Catholick Church* holds and believes. But among other Truths that are deriv'd to us by this *Universal Tradition*, or common Consent of all Nations, as afore explain'd; this is One, *That the Holy Ghost, or the Spirit of God, doth assist the Church, and doth guide her*

into

into all Truth necessary to Salvation. Hence we conclude ;

1. *That the Catholick Church is Infallible in all the Articles of Faith that she holds and professes.* For, since the *H. Ghost* is given to the Church to guide her into all Truth, and that this *Holy Spirit* is *Omniscient* and *Omnipotent*, it cannot be affirm'd without Impiety, that it should permit her to fall into Error.

2. *That General Councils are Infallible in all their Definitions and Decisions of Faith.* For, tho' a *General Council* be but a *Representative* of the whole Church ; yet, because *General Assemblies* of the *Chief Pastors* of the Church have been always look'd upon, even by the *Apostles* themselves (whose Steps in this Particular the Church doth follow) as the best and most effectual Means of determining any Controversy that may arise ; and that all Good *Christians* have always held themselves bound to acquiesce to their Determinations, and to submit to them, it is reasonable to believe, that the *Spirit of God* doth assist and guide them.

3. *That the Catholick Church is Infallible in determining what Books of Scripture are Canonical, and what Books are not ; and in declaring the true Sense and Interpretation of them.* For, since these sacred Books, and the right Interpretation of them, are very necessary for the Edification of our Faith and Manners, the same Spirit which guides the Church into all Truth, does, no doubt, guide her in these great and important Truths. We shall see hereafter what Society of *Christians* can

justly pretend to be called the *Catholick Church*. I now proceed to prove from *Scripture*, that the *Church* is *Infallible*.

But whereas the *Protestants* are accustomed to carp at this kind of Proof, pretending that this is to *dance in a Circle*, as they are pleas'd to term it; it won't be amiss to examine what is meant by a *Circle*, and when it is to be admitted in Reasoning.

When Two things bear witness mutually the one of the other, we call this *A Circle*; and when they have nothing else to support the Truth of their *Evidence*, but their mutual Affirmation, then that sort of Proof is faulty: But when both, or either, have such *Evidence* on their side, as is sufficient to establish their Credit, before they bear witness one of another, tho' it be still a *Circle*, yet it is good and valid in all sort of Proof. Thus *God the Father* bore witness of *J. Christ*, and He again of the *Father*. Thus *J. Christ* bore witness of *John the Baptist*, and *John the Baptist* likewise of Him. And I hope no Body will be so impious, as to say, these were vicious or faulty *Evidences*; because *God the Father's* Testimony was known to be True, tho' *J. Christ* had not confirm'd It; and *J. Christ's* His Works, prov'd likewise His Own Testimony to be True, tho' His *Father* had not born Him witness. In like manner, the *Church* bears witness, that the *Scripture* is the *Word of God*; and the *Scripture* again bears witness, that the *Church* is *Infallible*; and yet this Way of Reasoning is not in the least defective, because the *Church* has sufficient Credentials



dentials for the Truth of its *Evidence*, before it receives a Testimony from the *Scripture*, viz. *The universal Consent of the whole Ca. Church*, which, as is already proved, is undoubtedly certain. The Testimony then of *Scripture* bearing witness of the Church, is, properly speaking, *Argumentum ad Hominem*, that is, *An Argument from a Concession*, or, *A Principle agreed upon by both Parties*.

And now, since the *Protestants* do agree, that the *Scripture* is infallibly true; I hope they will hear it, if it bears witness of the *Infallibility of the Church*. Let us see then what It says upon this Subject. *Christ* saith, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Mat. xvi. V. 18.* Again, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the H. Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the End of the World. Cap. xxviii. V. 19. 20.* And again, *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now; howbeit, when the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all Truth. John xvi. V. 12, 13.* S. Paul writes to Timothy, *But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth. 1 Tim. iii. Ver. 15.*

You see, *Christian Reader*, that *Christ* promis'd to build His Church upon a Rock, and that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it;

## The Infallibility

that He Himself continues with it *unto the End of the World*; that the Spirit of Truth shall guide it into all Truth. And St. Paul says, that the Church of God is *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth*. Now if any Man, that believes the Goodness and Power of *J. Christ* to perform what He promises, can shew me any Text in *Scripture* more plain and evident to prove any thing else, than these do the *Infallibility of the Church*; I shall hold myself highly oblig'd to him for that Favour. If the *Gates*, or Power of Hell (for they are both the same) shall not prevail against the Church, surely then it shall not fall into Error: For there are but Two Ways of prevailing against it, *viz. By destroying all the Members that compose it, as to their Temporal Being*; Or, *By corrupting their Souls with Error*. That the *Gates of Hell* hath not prevail'd as to the former, our own *Being* is a sufficient Evidence; and that they shall not as to the latter, methinks a sober modest Man ought to be content with the Insuranc of *Christ's* Promise. If *Christ* continues with the Church *unto the End of the World*, can it be imagined, that He should suffer it to fall into Error, since we cannot suppose Him to have any other Business to continue with it, than to preserve it from that? If the *H. Ghost*, or, as the Text calls Him, *The Spirit of Truth*, will guide the Church into all Truth, we must surely renounce all Pretence to Reason and *Christianity*, if we believe that any Power, whether *Earthly* or *Infernal*, can be able to make it Err. Lastly, If the Church be the

Ground

*Ground and Pillar of Truth*, as S. Paul calls it, certainly neither Rain nor Flouds, nor Wind, can shake or throw down an Edifice so firmly founded. I shall now add Three or Four Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers, in favour of this Truth, and so conclude this Chapter.

Saint Irenaus, a Father of the Second Age, writes thus of the Church; *Where the Church is, there is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of God is, there is all Grace.* Lib. iii. C. xl.

In the Third Age, Origen, *That only is to be believed for Truth, which in nothing disagrees from the Tradition of the Church.* And a little after: *We must not believe otherwise, than as the Church of God has by Succession deliver'd to us.* In the same Age, S. Cyprian: *Whoever divides from the Church, and cleaves to the Adulteress, is separated from the Promises of the Church; he cannot have God his Father, that has not the Church his Mother.* Again: *To Peter's Chair, and the Principal Church, Infidelity or false Faith cannot have Access.* Ep. lv.

Præf. in  
Lib. per  
Ar.

In the Fourth Age, Saint Jerome: *The Roman Faith commended by the Apostles, cannot be changed.* In Apolog. cont. Ruffin.

In the Beginning of the 5th Age, S. Augustine: *I know by Divine Revelations, that the Spirit of Truth teacheth it (the Church) all Truth.* Lib. iv. de Bap. C. iv. Again: *To dispute against the whole Church is insolent Madness; and, I my self would not believe the Gospel, were it not that the Authority of the Church moves me to it.* Cont. Epist. Fundam. C. v.

I shall not trouble the Reader with any Reflections upon these Sentences, but will let them



them stand or fall by their own Weight, persuaded as I am, that no Comment, or Gloss whatsoever, can make them speak plainer, or more to my Purpose: I will only mind him, that these Great and Eminent Men, who shin'd in the *Church* like so many Lights, as well by the Lustre of their extraordinary Piety, as by the Profoundness of their Learning, cou'd not be ignorant of the Doctrine of the *C Church* of their Time: Consequently wou'd never have taught so peremptorily the *Infallibility of the Church*, unless it had been the Opinion of all the *Christian World*. There is then an *Infallible Church*, that is to say, *A Congregation of Faithful, that believes, holds, and teaches, the Doctrine of J. Christ.* 1. *Upon the universal Consent of the Christian World.* 2. *Upon clear and plain Texts of Scripture;* declaring the Assistance of the *H. Ghost*, to guide it into all Truth. 3. *Upon the unanimous Consent of the Fathers of the Primitive Times;* A Triple Cord, which neither the Power of *Hell*, nor the Subtilty of Hereticks, nor the Malice of the World, shall ever be able to break. Let us now examine what Society of *Christians* can justly lay claim to, or be truly call'd, the *Catholick Church*.

---

#### CHAP. II.

*The Congregation of Faithful in communion with the Bishop of Rome, and no other, is the Catholick Church.*

**T**O prove this Assertion, I shall lay down some Principles known, either by their  
OWN

own Light, or sufficiently proved by plain Texts of Scripture, and the Consent of our Adversaries.

I. *That in the Ca. Church there is, and shall be a Continued Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Teachers, from Christ to the End of the World.*

II. *That there is but One Catholick Church.*

III. *That One Communion, as well as One Faith, is essential to the Being of One Church.*

IV. *That whosoever separates from, or is excommunicated by the Church, for the obstinate Denial of any Article of the Faith, which the Church professes, cannot justly be call'd a Member of the Church.*

1. *In the C. Church there is, and shall be a Continued Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Teachers, from Christ, to the End of the World.* This is manifest from these Words of S. Paul; *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the edifying the Body of Christ, till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, &c. Eph. iv. 11, 12.*

2. *There is but One C. Church.* This is evident from Christ's own Words; *I have other Sheep which are not of this Fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My Voice, and there shall be One Fold and One Shepherd. John x. 16.* And from these Words of the Nicene Creed, *I believe One Holy Catholick Apostolick Church.*

3. *One Communion, as well as One Faith, is essential to the Being of One Church.* This is no less evident from the aforesaid Words of Christ,

*Christ*, Who says, That His *Sheep* will not only *hear* His *Voice*, but also shall be brought all into *One Fold*, than from the very Notion, which as well *Protestants* as *Catholicks* have of a *Church*; namely, That it is a *Congregation of the Faithful*, believing and practising the same things, with due *Subjection and Subordination* to their *Lawful Pastors*. This Truth the Gentlemen of the *Church of England* are very loth to own, in their Disputes with the *R. Catholicks*; and not without Reason: For they are sensible, that all their Authority and Mission, if any they have, are deriv'd from the *Church of Rome*; and that, if Unity in Communion, which, as aforesaid, implies a *due Subjection and Subordination to Lawful Pastors*, be essential to the Being of the *Catholick Church*, they quite unchurch themselves, since it is manifest, that in the Beginning of the Reign of *Q. Elizabeth*, they shook off all Obedience and Subjection to their Bishops, who were all *R. Catholicks*, and drove them all away; and in some Years before, in *K. Henry the VIII.* his Time, what with Death, and other Cruelties, they compell'd most of them to divide and separate from the *Pope*, and all other Bishops in the World besides. They wou'd therefore willingly pass by this sore Place, if possible; but when the Dispute is with the *Presbyterians*, this Truth is highly magnified. These they look upon to be *Schismatics*, because they separated from their Communion, and erected Altars against their Altars; and so far, indeed they are in the right, if a Separation from a Separation may be



be call'd *Schism*. However, this I cannot but admire, that they do not observe, that in charging the *Presbyterians* with *Schism*, they condemn themselves, since it is notoriously known, they are highly guilty of what they charge them with, namely, *Of separating from their own, and all other Bishops in the World*. Whoever desires further Satisfaction in this Matter, may consult Dr. *Heylin's* History of the *Presbyterians*, intitled, *Aerius Redivivus*, and the *History of the Reformation*, by the same Author, but more especially an ingenious Treatise, lately publish'd by a Learned Divine of the *Church of England*, under this Title, *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*. In this the Author proves excellently well the Necessity of *One Communion* as well as of *One Faith*, for the Being of *One Church*. I will transcribe some of his Words, and leave the Reader to judge how well he proves my *Postulatum*. " Now they were thus united (saith he, speaking of all the Bishops in the *Catholick Church*) " by the Great and Fundamental Laws of *One Faith*, and *One Communion*. That the *One Holy Catholick Faith* " is essential in the Constitution of *One Holy C. Church*, is, even this Day, a Receiv'd " Principle, I think, amongst all sober *Christians*: But when, I say, that the *Christians* " in St. *Cyprian's* Time, reckon'd the Laws " of *One Communion* every whit as forcible " and indispensable to the Being of *One Church*, as the Laws of *One Faith*. It was a " Prime, a Fundamental Article of their " Faith, that there was but *One Church*, and " they

## The Infallibility

“ they cou’d not understand, how there  
 “ cou’d be but *One Church*, if there was more  
 “ than *One Communion*. By their *Principles*  
 “ and *Reasonings*, a Multiplication of *Com-*  
 “ *munion*s made unavoidably a Multiplicati-  
 “ on of *Churches*; and by consequence, seeing  
 “ there cou’d be but *One True C. Church*,  
 “ there cou’d be likewise but *One True C.*  
 “ *Communion*. All other *Churches* or *Commu-*  
 “ *nions* were false, *i. e.* not at all *Christian*  
 “ *Churches* or *Communions*. Thus far this  
 Learned Man, and indeed very right: For  
 it was the constant Principle, as well of all  
 as of the Primitive Ages of the *Church*, that  
*One Communion* was no less essential to the  
 Being of *One Church*, nor less necessary to  
*Salvation*, than *One Faith*. And here I cannot  
 but observe Two things by the way; 1. *How*  
*unjust that intolerable Charge of Uncharitable-*  
*ness is, wherewith the Protestants incessantly*  
*traduce the R. Catholicks, for denying them*  
*Salvation out of their Communion*; since it is  
 manifest, as this Learned Man says, that *One*  
*Faith* and *One Communion* are equally neces-  
 sary to *Salvation*; and no less evident, that  
 the *Protestants* separated themselves from  
 that *Communion* and *Faith*, which the *R. Ca-*  
*tholicks* believe and maintain to be the *True*  
*Church*. How is it then consistent with their  
 Principles to allow *Salvation* to the *Prote-*  
*stants* whilst they persist in their Separation?  
 Or how can they be deem’d *uncharitable*, for  
 judging according to the known Principles  
 of the Primitive *Christians*, who knew but *One*  
*Faith* and *One Communion*, wherein *Salvation*  
was

was to be had? 2. *What miserable Shifts the Church of England Gentlemen are driven to; being forc'd to deny to the R. Catholicks in their own Justification, what they so earnestly press upon the Presbyterians, in order to reclaim them, as Constant and Fundamental Principles in the Primitive Church.*

4. *Whosoever separates from, or is excommunicated by the Church, for the obstinate Denial of any Article of the Faith, which it professeth, cannot reasonably be call'd a Member of the Church.* This is Self-evident, as to the first part; for to separate from the Church, is to go away from it, as the very Word imports, and by consequence to be no more a Member of it. It is likewise no less evident, as to the second; for to excommunicate is to put out of Communion, or to cut off from the Body of the Church; so that whoever is excommunicated for the Denial of any Article of Faith, can no more be said to be united to the Church, than an Arm cut off from a Man, or a Branch from a Tree, can be said to be united to the same Man or Tree. All such then, who wilfully separate from the Communion of the C. Church, let their Pretence be never so plausible, are properly Schismatics: I say, *Let their Pretence be never so plausible; for Dr. Hammond tells us as aforesaid, That it is impossible the Church shou'd give them such Provocation as might justify a Separation.* In like manner, all those who are excommunicated by the Church, for their obstinate Refusal to assent to any Truth, declar'd to be an Article of Faith, are properly call'd Hereticks.

Now



Now, *Protestants* as well as *Catholicks* agree, that neither *Schismaticks*, nor *Hereticks*, are Members of the *C. Church*, nor any way within its Pale: There only remains then to examine, who those are on whom these Marks of *Schism* and *Heresy* are justly chargeable, and who, on the other hand, are free from that Charge, which, if plainly made out, it will be easy to see, what Congregation of Faithful can be justly call'd the *C. Church*.

Now, all the Societies of *Christians*, who with any Colour of Reason, can pretend to the Name of *Catholick*, are these: 1. *The Nestorians and Eutychians*. 2. *The Greek Church*. 3. *The Church of England*. And lastly, *The R. Catholicks*. I have on purpose omitted the *Waldenses*, *Socinians*, *Hussites*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and all those almost innumerable *Sects* continually shooting out of the Trunk of the *Reformation*, and spreading far and near over our own unfortunate Islands, as *Anabaptists*, *Independents*, *Quakers*, *Muggletonians*, *Seekers*, *Familists*, *Philadelphians*, &c. because all these are destitute of even the least Pretence to the Name of *C. Church*, having neither Lawful Pastors, Lawful Mission, nor right Ordination, which, as all the *Christian World*, before the *Reformation*, and as the *Church of England* still grants, cannot be given without Imposition of Hands, perform'd by Bishops. This they ingeniously own they have not, consequently nor the least Pretence to the *C. Church*, no nor, if we believe some Learned Divines of the *Church of England*, to the Name of *Christian*:

For,

For, as these Gentlemen reason, no Man can be call'd *Christian*, unless he is baptis'd; *Baptism* cannot be conferr'd but by such, who have Authority to administer the Sacraments; no Man can have this Authority, but by Lawful Ordination; and this is not conferr'd, nor cannot, without *Imposition of Hands* by Lawfully Ordain'd Bishops. Bishops all these *Sects* own they have not; consequently nor true *Baptism*, nor *Christianity*.

This, I confess, cannot be said of the Four Societies aforesaid: For every one of them hath always retain'd the *Hierarchy* of the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, at least, have pretended to it; and think it essential to the Being of the *Catholick Church*: But since this is not enough, unless they have likewise the *Catholick Faith* and *Communion*, which, together with the said *Hierarchy*, make up the essential Parts of *Catholick Religion*; our present Business shall be to try each of them by this *Touchstone*, and see which will abide the Test.

1. *Touching the Nestorians and Eutychians*: Under this Appellation, I comprehend the *Jacobites*, *Cophes*, *Armenians*, and all other *Sects*, who follow the Opinions of *Nestorins* and *Eutyches*, touching the *Person*; and *Natures* in *Christ*; all the rest of the *Eastern Christians*, either adhering to the *Roman*, or *Greek Church*. What I have to say concerning these *Sects*, shall be dispatch'd in a few Words. Dr. Tillotson, and all the Learned Men of the *Church of England*, do receive the *Definitions* of the Four First General Councils, whereof

whereof the Two Last excommunicated and condemn'd as Hereticks, the Authors of these *Sects* and their Adherents; *Nestorins*, for asserting Two Persons; *Eutyches*, for denying Two *Natures* in *Christ*; consequently all those *Sects*, who took up their Opinions, are justly excluded from the Number of true *Catholicks*. As to the Points in Controversy betwixt the *Church of Rome* and the *Protestants*, viz. *Transubstantiation*, *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c. they are as firmly believ'd by the said *Sects*, as by the *Roman Catholicks*.

2. As for the *Greek Church*: It is notoriously known, that the chiefest Reason of their Separation from the *Church of Rome*, was, because this *Church* asserted the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Father* and the *Son*, which yet the *Protestants* hold to be *Orthodox Doctrine*: And no less evident, that the *Greek Church* did recant their Error concerning this Point, and all other things wherein they differ'd from the *Church of Rome*, many times, but more especially in *Three General Councils*; *First*, In the Council of *Latheran*, where the *Patriarch of Constantinople* assisted in Person. *Secondly*, In the Council of *Lyons*, where the *Greek Emperour*, and other Representatives of the *Greek Church* were present. And lastly, In the Council of *Florence*, where the *Emperour*, the *Patriarch of Constantinople*, and a great many *Greek Bishops*, were present, and disputed the Point for a long time; which, at last, came to this Issue. There were Letters of Union drawn



drawn up, wherein the *Grecians* do acknowledge the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Father* and *Son*, the *Pope's* Supremacy, and some other Points of no great Weight, before debated. These Letters were signed by the Emperour, and by all the *Greek Bishops* (the Bishop of *Ephesus* only excepted) and stand upon Record to this Day. Whence it is manifest, that by their own Act and Deed, they are convicted of Schism, for their wilful, and causeless Separation afterwards from the *Church of Rome*, whom they own'd by this Authentick Instrument to be the *Catholick Church*, and themselves likewise to be Members of it.

Touching the main Points in Controversy betwixt the *Protestants* and the *Church of Rome*; what the *Greek Church* holds and professes, let us hear from the Pen of an ingenious *Protestant Gentleman*, Sir Edwin Sandys, in his *Europa Speculum*, p. 233. " With *Rome* (saith he) " they concur in the Opinion of " *Transubstantiation*, and generally in the Sacrifice and whole Body of the *Mass*; in " Praying to Saints; in *Auricular Confession*; " in offering of Sacrifice and Prayer for the " Dead; and in these, without any or no " material Difference. They hold *Purgatory* " also, and the Worshipping of Pictures. Thus far Sandys. So that, tho' the *Greeks* were a true Church, it wou'd but very little help the *Protestant Cause*, nay rather, it wou'd very much prejudice it; since the *Grecians* hold those Points to be Orthodox; on the pretended Falsity whereof, the *Protestants*

ground their Separation: But of this more in its proper Place.

3. Touching the *Church of England*. This is of so great Importance to our present Controversy, or rather the only necessary Point to be rightly understood, that it is requisite it should be handled with all the Clearness and Perspicuity imaginable: And if it be possible to make it evident, that this Church is branded with Heresy and Schism, (Two things sufficient to unchurch any Society of *Christians* whatsoever) I hope I may, without Vanity, say, that I have gained my Point. To prove then, that the *Church of England* is both Heretical and Schismatical (I am heartily sorry I must use such hard Expressions to so many Ingenious and Great Men, whose Learning and other good Qualities I very much honour and respect) I shall make use of no Arguments, but such as are grounded upon the clear Light of Natural Reason, upon the Consent of Mankind, and the Concession of our Adversaries; and upon such known and evident Matters of Fact, as the most impudent Wrangler would be ashamed to deny.

As to the First; *That the Church of England is Heretical*, I prove thus: Whatsoever Society of *Christians* obstinately denies any Doctrine, believ'd by the *Catholick Church* to be of Faith, is Heretical; but the *Church of England* denies obstinately some Doctrines, believ'd by the *Catholick Church* to be of Faith. Therefore the *Church of England* is Heretical. The Major, or First Proposition, is known

known Principle, which no *Christian* in his Wits ever denied: The Minor, or Second Proposition, I demonstrate thus: The *Church of England* obstinately denies *Transubstantiation*, the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, and many other Points; but these are believ'd by the *Catholick Church* to be of Faith: Therefore the *Church of England* denies obstinately some Doctrines believ'd by the *Catholick Church* to be of Faith. That the *Church of England* obstinately denies the said Doctrines or Points, is Matter of Fact, and what she very much glories in: That the same Points or Doctrine were all, in the Beginning of the *Reformation*, believed by the *Catholick Church* to be of Faith, we have, besides the unanimous Consent of the *Roman, Greek*, and all the *Eastern Churches*, the Testimony of several Learned *Protestants*, who, surely wou'd never have told a thing so favourable to their Adversaries; if it had not been manifestly true. And to shew, that it is not said *Gratis*, I will instance in some.

*Hospinian* faith, *Luther's Separation* was from all the World. Epist. 141.

*White*: Popery was a Leprosy breeding so universally in the Church, that there was no visible Company of Men appearing in the World free from it. Defence, c. xxxvii. p. 136. The aforesaid Doctrine is what this Good Man is pleas'd to call Popery, as all the World knows.

*Bishop Jewel*: The whole World, Princes, Priests, and People, were overwhelm'd with Ignorance, and bound by Oath to the Pope. Sermon on Luke xi.



*Whitaker : In Times past no Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church. Controv. 4, 9, 5. c. iii.*

*Bucer : All the World err'd in that Article of the Real Presence. p. 660.*

*Calvin : They made all the Kings and People of the Earth drunk, from the First to the Last. Justit. 4. c. xviii.*

*Perkins : During the Space of 900 Years, the Popish Heresy had spread it self over the whole World. Exposit. Symb p. 266.*

The Sum of this Cloud of Witnesses, which yet is not the Twentieth Part of what may be brought from the *Reformation Treasure*, amounts to this; *That before the Reformation, there was no other Religion in the whole Christian World, but the Rom. Catholick, or, as they are pleas'd to term it, the Papistical; and that the aforesaid Points and many more, which they call Popery, Leprosy, and Ignorance, were universally believed, as Articles of Faith, by all the visible Companies of Christians in the World. And if this be true; the Church of England, which obstinately denies these Points, and many more, must necessarily deny some Doctrines believ'd by the Catholick Church as of Faith; and by consequence the Church of England is Heretical.*

Touching the Second, *viz. That the Church of England is Schismatical.* This is no less evident than the former: For, if *Schism* be *A wilful Separation from the Church*, as it is defined by all Mankind, as well *Protestants* as *Catholicks*; the Church of England is doubly guilty of this Crime. *First*, for separating from the Pope, and their own immediate Heads,

Heads, *The Bishops of England*. Secondly, for separating from the Communion of all other Bishops in the World besides.

The *Bishop of Rome*, in the Beginning of the *Reformation*, was acknowledg'd by all the World to be, at least, *Patriarch of the West*; and by the *Protestants* themselves, to have exercis'd Jurisdiction over the *Church of England* for 900 Years and more; even from the time of its Conversion to *Christianity*; and surely, so long a Prescription is a sufficient Title, tho' no other cou'd be shewn.

We find in the Acts of the Third General Council held at *Ephesus*, a Complaint exhibited by the *Bishop of Constantia* in *Cyprus*, against the *Patriarch of Antioch*, who wou'd force that Island to submit to his Jurisdiction, and oblige its *Metropolitan* to receive the *Grace of Ordination* from him, as the Council phrases it. To this Complaint the Council answers, That if the Bishops of *Cyprus* cou'd make out, that the *Patriarch of Antioch*, had never conferr'd Orders upon their *Metropolitan*, it was unjust to pretend to it now. And the Business being fairly prov'd in favour of the said Bishops; the Council decreed, That the *Patriarch of Antioch* had no Jurisdiction over them, nor ought to pretend to any. Whence it is manifest, that if the *Patriarch of Antioch* cou'd prove that he had conferr'd Orders upon their *Metropolitan*, at any time; or exercis'd Lawful Jurisdiction over them, the Council wou'd have decreed the said Island to be subject to him; and that as it was a manifest Usurpation in the *Patri-*

Binius  
Tom. 2.  
Append. 1.  
Cap. 4.

*arch of Antioch* to pretend to any such Jurisdiction ; since he was not in the Possession of it, nor cou'd prove to have ever had it ; so likewise, it wou'd be perfect Rebellion and Schism in them to withdraw from his Jurisdiction, if he were legally possess'd of it ; Now, I wou'd fain know, if the same Council were to judge the *Church of England*, and the *Pope's* Cause, what they wou'd think of it ? *Pope Eleutherius* sent some of his own Clergy to convert the *Britains* in King *Lucius* his Time, *St. Gregory* sent *Augustine* the Monk, and others to convert the *Saxons*, and exercis'd Jurisdiction over them, ordaining their Metropolitan, or causing him to be ordain'd by his Orders ; and the *Popes* his Successours continued in peaceable Possession of this Prerogative, and they (*the Clergy and People of England*) receiving and obeying his Lawful Commands, not only as *Patriarch of the West*, but even as *Head of the Church*, for the Space of 900 Years and more ; what wou'd this Council, I say, think of the *Church of England's* Rising up against the *Pope's* Authority after so long a Prescription ? Certainly it wou'd look upon them to be Rebels against the Authority the best establish'd in the World. Nor will it any way help them to say, as they usually do, that the *King of England* has power to transfer the *Papal*, or *Patriarchal* Power from *Rome*, and confer it upon the *Archbishop of Canterbury* : For, besides that it is most absurd to suppose such a Power in a King ; since it cannot be imagin'd, whence such an Ecclesiastical Authority



Authority can be deriv'd to a Secular Prince; we have an exprefs Decree to the contrary in the Fourth General Council held at *Calcedon*: What gave Occasion to it, was this. The *Bishop of Tyre* was anciently *Metropolitan of Phœnicia*, and as fuch, exercis'd Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in that Province. *Marcianus* the Emperour (contrary to the Canon of the *Council of Nice*, by which it was provided, That there shou'd be but One Metropolitan in each Province) made a Pragmatick Sanction whereby he constituted the *Bishop of Berithum* Metropolitan in the same Province, and submitted a great many of the former Metropolitan's Suffragans to him: Which when the *Bishop of Tyre* expos'd to the Council, it was unanimously decreed, That the said *Bishop of Tyre* should be restor'd to all his Privileges and Jurisdiction, notwithstanding the Emperour's Sanction; which the Council declar'd to be of no Force or Virtue against the Canons of the Church. So that it is evident, this General Council knew nothing of any such Ecclesiastical Power vested in the Emperour, tho' Lord of almost all the World; much less in a Prince of a few Provinces. 'Tis true, there is a Canon of a Council held long after in *Constantinople*, called *Quinisexta Synodus*, which provides, That if the Emperour shou'd erect, or raise any City to the Dignity of Metropolis of a Province, the Ecclesiastical Power ought to follow the Temporal. The Sense of which Canon, I conceive must be this, That either the Bishop of the City thus dignified, was to have

Concil.  
Calced.  
Act. 6.

have the Jurisdiction of a Metropolitan over all the Bishops in the Province (the former Metropolitan being reduc'd to the Condition of a Private Bishop) or that the same Province ought to be divided into Two, and governed by Two Metropolitans with distinct Limits and Jurisdictions. Whether of the Two be the Sense of those Fathers, 'tis manifest, this Canon does not exempt the one, or the other from the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch, much less from that of the *Pope*, as Head of the Church. And indeed, to give it the most rigorous Interpretation, it is impossible to stretch it any further than this; That when a City is made Metropolis, or Head of a Kingdom, the Bishop of that City ought to have jurisdiction over all the Bishops in the same Kingdom: But this does not give the least colour to any Exemption from the Ecclesiastical Power to which this Kingdom was subject before. Besides, this same was not enacted by the Emperor, or any Secular Prince; but by a Council of Bishops in favour, doubtless of the Episcopal Dignity; because it was proper, that the First Bishop, or Metropolitan shou'd have his Seat in the Metropolis of the Kingdom, and take his Denomination from thence. And yet we see, this never took place in the West; otherwise the *Bishops of Paris*, in *France*; of *London*, in *England*; of *Edinburgh*, in *Scotland*; and others might as justly pretend to a Primacy in these several Kingdoms; which, I am confident the *Archbishop of Canterbury* wou'd as much oppose, as any of the rest.

Now,

Stow,  
Baker, Dr.  
Heylin,  
Dr. Bur.  
net.

Now, that the *Church of England* did wilfully separate from the *Pope*, from their own immeniate Heads, the Bishops of *England*, and from the Communion of all the Bishops in the World besides, is plain Matter of Fact, equally<sup>e</sup> attested by all Writers as well *Protestants* as *Catholicks*. K. *Henry VIII.* did separate from the *Pope*, and assum'd to himself the Title of *Head of the Church of England*, persecuting and putting to death all such, who oppos'd his Supremacy. After the Death of Q. *Mary*, in whose Reign the *Church of England* was again reconcil'd to *Rome*; Q. *Elizabeth* call'd a Parliament in order to settle Matters of Religion. In this Parliament, all the Bishops of *England* were depriv'd of their Episcopal Sees; some cast into Prison, others banish'd the Country, all violently forc'd away from their Flocks and Pastoral Functions. Nor will at all relieve the *Protestant Cause*, to say (which yet is their only Plea) that the Bishops were depriv'd, because they would not take the *Oath of Supremacy* reviv'd by that Parliament. For, beside that, it is an unheard of thing, that any Society of Laymen shou'd take upon them to determine Spiritual Matters (for such was the Tenor of that Oath) and to impose them upon Bishops, to whom it chiefly belong'd to determine such Matters: This Proceeding was contrary to the ordinary Methods of Parliament, both before, and ever after that time: For all things relating to Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Matters, are first determin'd and agreed upon in the Convocation of the Bishops,



ops, whose Province and Care it is to declare what is Spiritual, and what not; and then referr'd to both Houses of Parliament, to pass into Law. But here is a Spiritual Matter pass'd into a Law, which vests the Supreme Spiritual Power in the Queen; and which all the Bishops in the Kingdom solemnly protest against, as a thing as monstrously absurd, as it was ever before unheard of. And yet they must be all depriv'd because they wou'd not swear to the Truth of, nor assert this Spiritual Power lodg'd in a Person, whose very Sex rendred her incapable of. Indeed, they might as well deprive them, for not believing and swearing to the Truth of the *Alcoran*: But this is too absurd to need a Confutation.

That the *Church of England* separated from the Communion of all other Bishops in the World, is evident even to this Day, since they never were able to shew as much as One Single Bishop in the whole World, who professeth to be of their Communion. Now if all this be not Schism, I confess, I know not what is. To separate from the *Pope*, and all in communion with him: To separate from their own Bishops, and raise Altars against their Altars, or rather to pull down all Altars, as they have done; to separate from all the Bishops in the World: If this be not in the highest Degree Schismatical, farewell Reason and Religion. And here I may justly make the same Intercession (as *S. Paul* calls it) against the *Church of England*, with that of *Elijah* against the *Schismatical Church*

*Church of Israel*, whose perfect Image I am sorry they bear. " Lord, they have killed " Thy Bishops and Priests, and digged down thine Altars; and we poor persecuted Sheep are left alone, and they seek our Lives to take them away.

4. As to the *Roman Catholicks*, I need not urge any more Reasons than what has been already offer'd, to prove that this Society of *Christians* is the *True Catholick Church*: For since it is manifestly prov'd, that neither the *Nestorian*, nor the *Eutychian*, nor the *Greek*, nor yet the *Church of England*, is the *Catholick Church*; it remains, that the *Roman Catholicks* must necessarily be it: However, I shall lay down some Notes agreed on by all Sides, to pertain to the *Catholick Church*, which upon Examination will be found to be peculiar to the *Roman Catholick Church*.

1. *The Roman Catholick Church is a great Body of the Faithful spread over all the known Parts of the World*; there being but few Kingdoms known, where some Believers in communion with the *Bishop of Rome*, are not to be found: Hence she justly claims the Title of *Catholick*.

2. *If we except the Protestants, there are are but few material Points in which all other Sects differ from her*. And most of these are condemned by the *Protestants*; as are most, if not all the Points, wherein the *Protestants* differ from her condemned by all other Sects. An evident Argument, that she alone hath the Truth; since, if these things which they ground their Separation upon, had been evident,

vident, as they pretend, they wou'd all agree in them.

3. *All other Sects separated from the Communion of the Church of Rome, beginning each Sect, in One, or Two, in opposition to the whole World: And we are able to point at the Age, and Year of their Separation; and at the Name and Character of each Sect's Author and Promoter. An Argument that she is the Mother Church or Root of the Tree, and those Sects some Branches fallen, or cut off.*

4. *The Roman Catholick Church was never condemn'd by any General Council, nor yet by any Council of Bishops, whether National or Provincial, for the Points of Faith, which the Protestants contest, if we except the Bishops made in England by Secular Power, when the True Bishops were all discarded: But the Opinions held by the Protestants, and all other Sects, in opposition to the Church of Rome, were condemn'd by several General Councils, as every Learned Man can tell.*

5. *It cou'd never be made out, in what Age, or Year, or in whose Reign, or by whom, any of the Points in Dispute were introduc'd into the Catholick Belief. An evident Argument, that they were believ'd from the Beginning; it being impossible to conceive how all the Christian World cou'd be induc'd to believe those things contrary to what they held before, and yet that no Man shou'd perceive it: Nay, it is absurd and ridiculous to imagine, that the greatest part of Mankind shou'd not be alarm'd at the Novelty of a Doctrine, which, if we believe the Protestants, shocks so much*  
both



both Sense and Reason; whereas the New Doctrine of *Arius, Nestorius, Luther, Calvin*, and the rest of his Tribe, so violently shook the whole Earth, that to this very Day, our own woful Experience is but too sensible a Testimony of its direful Effects.

Lastly, *The Roman Catholick Church hath the universal Consent of all the Christian World for her Tenets in Matters of Faith; if we except that of the different Sects, which sprung up at different time; which, as it is before proved, amounts to no more, than the Dissent or Contradiction of One Single Man concerning One Point, in One Age; and of another, concerning another Point, or more, in a different Age, at least, at different times; and that in opposition to all the rest of Mankind: A Prerogative which no other Society of Christians can pretend to; it being evident, and even confess'd by themselves, that the Opinions which they hold, in opposition to the Roman Catholicks, were taken up by certain Men in different Ages and Times; by Luther in the 16th Century; by Wickliff, in the 13th; by De Waldo in the 12th, &c.*

I will then conclude, That since the *Roman Catholick Church* is as universal in its Communion, as almost, the Bounds of the *Earth*; as ancient in its Doctrine, as the Apostles of *Christ*; since it was it alone, that adher'd to the Ancient Faith, and rejected the Novelty of all Heresies; and can only glory in having the universal Consent of the *Christian World* (as before explain'd) for the Truth of  
its

its Doctrine: This Society, and no other, is the True *Catholick Apostolick Church*. I shall now proceed to answer Dr. Tillotson's Objections to this Point.

The First is taken out of Vol. 2. Ser. pag. 50, 61, 62. which in Substance is this. "Tho' the *Roman Catholics* be very stiff, "and peremptory in asserting their *Infallibility*; yet they are not agreed among "themselves, where it is seated; whether "in the *Pope* alone, or in a Council alone, "or in both together, or in the diffusive Body of *Christians*. They are sure they have "it, says he, tho' they do not know where "it is. Then he adds, There is not the least "Intimation in *Scripture* of this Privilege "conferred upon the *Church of Rome*; and it "is strange, the Ancient Fathers, in their "Disputes against Hereticks, shou'd never "appeal to this Judge, it being so short "and expedite a Way of ending Controversies: And this very Consideration (concludes the Doctor) "is to a wise Man instead of a Thousand Arguments to satisfy "him, that, in those Days, no such thing "was believ'd in the World.

*Answer.* I may say of these Three Propositions; the First is neither true in it self, nor in most of its Circumstances. The Second is perfectly of the same Nature, if you except the Word *Rome*. The Third is grounded upon a Negative, and proves nothing.

I begin with the First. "They are not agreed (saith he) among themselves where "it is seated, &c. For my own part, I never

yet

yet read, or heard of any *Catholick* Divine, that ever said, That the *Catholick Church*, taken for the Diffusive Body of *Christians*, was not *Infallible* in declaring Matters of Faith; therefore; I think, all agree, that the *Infallibility* is seated in the Diffusive Body of *Christians*: And I challenge any *Protestant* in the World, to name me One, who says the contrary. The *Pope* is One, and the chief Member of that Diffusive Body. The *Pope*, and Council together, make a great many Members; and if you add to these all the rest of the Faithful, they make up the entire Diffusive Body of *Christians*. If the *Pope* be *Infallible*, surely the Concurrence of a Council will rather confirm, than diminish his *Infallibility*. If the *Pope* and Council together be *Infallible*, the Consent of the Diffusive Body of *Christians* must surely strengthen and confirm it; but if neither the *Pope*, nor the Council alone be *Infallible*, the Diffusive Body of *Christians* must necessarily be; if any such thing as *Infallibility* may be ascrib'd to any of the Three, seeing both *Pope* and Council are included in it. We are sure then the *Infallibility* consists, at least, in the Diffusive Body of *Christians*. But to illustrate this a little more, let us propose this familiar Example. If I shou'd ask where My *Lord Mayor of London* is, at this time? And that some shou'd tell me, *He is in his own House*; others, *Not in his own House, but somewhere in London*; and others, *Neither in his own House, nor in London, but in England*; I wou'd willingly know whether these Three sorts of People

F do



do not all agree that My Lord Mayor is in *England*? Certainly they do; because the Assent of the Two Former is necessarily implied in the Latter.

In like manner, tho' some say, the *Pope* is *Infallible*; others, not the *Pope* alone, but together with a General Council; and others, neither the *Pope* nor Council alone, without the Concurrence of the Diffusive Body of *Christians*; yet all do concenter in this, that the Diffusive Body of *Christianity* is *Infallible*. The Dr. then is very much out, when he says; *They do not know where it is, tho' they are sure they have it.*

In short, the Article of Faith clearly known, and unanimously assented to by all *Roman Catholicks* in regard to *Infallibility*, is only this (*viz.*) *That the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, by the Promise of Christ, in all Ages resides in the Catholick Church; infallibly declares and explains by the Pastors of the Church assembled in a General Council and united to their Head all Christian Verities.* In this great Principle of Faith all *Roman Catholicks* with Assurance and universal Concord agree; and herein consists the whole Notion of what *Roman Catholicks* mean by the Term of *Infallibility*.

Touching the 2d Proposition: "There is not the least Intimation in Scripture of this Privilege conferr'd upon the Church of Rome; and it is strange the Ancient Fathers in their Disputes against Hereticks, shou'd never appeal to this Judge, &c. That there is not only Intimation, but even plain

plain Texts of *Scripture*, which denote the Church's *Infallibility*, is what I think, is already sufficiently prov'd. And since it is likewise prov'd, that the *Roman Church*, or (which is the same thing) the Congregation of Faithful in communion with it, is the *Catholick Church*; I think it is a necessary Consequence, that there are plain Texts of *Scripture*, that prove the *Infallibility* of the *Church of Rome*. Nor is it less certain, that the Ancient Fathers, in their Disputes against Hereticks, did appeal to this Judge. For in those Days, there was no other Means to convince Hereticks of their Errours, but by the Authority of the *Church*. In the Primitive Times, New Heresies sprung up, as many, if not more than in any of our Latter Ages; yet there was no other Rule, or Standard to judge these Errours by, the Canonical Books of *Scripture* not being collected, or put together, at least, in 150 Years after the Foundation of the *Church*; and then not One Book of it all, whose Authority, or Credit was not question'd by some Heretick or other. How was it then possible for the Ancient Fathers to confute these Hereticks unless they had appeal'd to the Authority of the *Church*, and told them, that this is the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*; this is what we receiv'd from our Forefathers; and this is what all the *Christian World* believes?

Neither is it true, that the Ancient Fathers did not appeal to this Judge, even when the *Scripture* was collected, and receiv'd as the *Word of God*: Read but S. *Irenaus* con-

*tra Hares. Tertul. de Prascript. Epipha. de Hares. St. Austin cont. Epist. Fund.* and many more; and you shall find how much the Dr. was mistaken in this Business. I do not cite the Passages of these Fathers; because they are so well known, and so often quoted by others, who wrote upon this Subject: But let this of *St. Austin* (to use the Doctor's own Phrase) *be instead of a Thousand: I wou'd not believe the Gospel, were it not that the Authority of the Church moves me to it.*

Cont. Ep.  
Funda.

The 2d Objection is in answer to a certain Passage in the *Canon Law*, where it is said.  
*Vol. III.* "That if every Man may judge for himself;  
*Pag. 94.* "there will be nothing but Confusion in  
 "Religion; there will be no End of Con-  
 "troversies: And that our Lord had not  
 \* *The Drs.* "seem'd to be discreet, \* if He had not  
*Translati-* "provided for the Assurance of Mens  
*on of the* "Faith, by giving them an *Infallible* Judge.  
*Latin has* "To this he says, that if this Reasoning be  
*it so* "good, we may as well conclude, that  
 "there is an universal *Infallible* Judge in  
 "Temporal Matters; but it is evident in  
 "Fact and Experience, says he, that there  
 "is no such Judge in Temporal Matters  
 "consequently nor in Matters of Faith.

*Ans.* Had there been an universal *Infallible* Judge appointed in Temporal Matters, it wou'd, doubtless, contribute very much to the Peace and Tranquility of the World, if he were obey'd; but very little to the Means wherewith God Almighty designs to bring His chosen People to the Kingdom of *Heaven*; which is to exercise them with Fier

Trials



Trials, and make them pass thro' much Tribulation: And therefore He permits the Cruelty of Tyrants to try the Patience of Martyrs, and suffers the Oppression of the Poor on *Earth*, to inhance their Reward in *Heaven*. So that the Cruelty, or Errours of a Temporal Judge do rather increase, than diminish the Happiness of the Just. But the Case is far otherwise in Spiritual Matters: If the Judge shou'd spoil us of our Faith, or err in judging for us, it wou'd cause our *Eternal* Ruin, our *Damnation* being necessarily consequent upon a false Belief. And for that reason, the Goodness of God seems to be so much the more engag'd to secure the Spiritual, than the Temporal Judge from Errour; by how much the Danger is the greater on that Side, and the Ruin more inevitable, if we shou'd chance to err.

*Christ* threatens *Damnation* to all those that will not believe His Doctrine, which, how it can stand with His Infinite Goodness, unless He had provided *Infallible* Means of conveying the Truth of this Doctrine to them, it is hard to conceive. In short, Temporal Ease, and Tranquility is of very little Moment, even in this Life, but of none at all in the Next; and therefore generally speaking, God leaves Men in the *Counsel of their own Hands*, and permits them very often to disturb the publick Peace, and Quiet of this World: But the true Knowledge of His Divine Law, and of the Mysteries of our *Redemption*, are of so great Importance to our *Eternal Happiness*, that His

Goodness will infallibly secure it for us, if it be not our own Fault.

P. 94, 95.

Object. 3. *An Infallible Judge, if there were one, is no certain Way to end Controversies, and to preserve the Unity of the Church; unless it were likewise infallibly certain, that there is such a Judge, and who he is. For till Men were sure of both these, there wou'd be still a Controversy whether there be an Infallible Judge, and who he is. And if it be true which they tell us, that without an Infallible Judge Controversies cannot be ended; then a Controversy concerning an Infallible Judge can never be ended. And there are Two Controversies actually on foot, about an Infallible Judge; one, Whether there be an Infallible Judge, or not? Which is a Controversy between us and the Church of Rome: And the other, Who this Infallible Judge is? Which is a Controversy among themselves, which cou'd never yet be decided: And yet till it be decided, Infallibility, if they had it, wou'd be of no use to them for the ending of Controversies.* Thus far the Doctor's own Words.

*Ans.* That there is an *Infallible Judge*, is already prov'd: Who that Judge is, I have likewise manifestly shewn, namely, *The Living Voice of all the Catholick Pastors and People agreeing in the same Points of Faith.* And if it be further ask'd, *Who those Pastors and People are?* I answer, *The same in communion with the Pope*, as it is prov'd before. And surely none will doubt, but we may be infallibly certain, that these agree in the same Points of Faith. Consequently we may be infallibly certain both that there is an *Infallible Judge*, and who that Judge is.

*And*

*And if it be true which they tell us, says the Dr. that without an Infallible Judge, Controversies cannot be ended, then a Controversy concerning an Infallible Judge can never be ended. And why so? Why may not an Infallible Judge end it? Is not an Infallible Judge sufficient to end any Controversy whatsoever? If the Church be Infallible, and assisted by the Spirit of God for no other End, than to guide it into all Truth, surely it will not be wanting to it in this Point, which is the most material of all others. But I suppose the Dr. grounds his Argument upon this Axiom; No Man ought to be Judge in his own Cause. If he shou'd hence conclude that the Supreme Judge cannot decide a Controversy concerning his own Prerogative, he must certainly be a great Stranger to all Civil Laws and Constitutions in the World. The King and Parliament together are the Supreme Judge of all Causes in England. Now if we suppose, the rest of the People of England shou'd dispute that Prerogative; this Controversy, according to the Doctor's Principles, can never be ended. Not by the King and Parliament; for it is their own Cause, nor yet by the rest of the People of England; for it is not reasonable they shou'd be Judge and Party. Who must judge it then? No body. So that, if we stretch that Axiom thus far, we must leave undecided that, without which nothing can be lawfully decided. The true Sense of it then is this. No Man ought to be Judge in his own Cause; that is, No Private Man, who lives under Laws and Government,*



ought to judge for himself, or be his own Carver, but must have recourse to the ordinary Judges, whose Sentence he, and his Adverse Party are bound to obey. But this is by no means to be extended to the Supreme Legislative Power, whose very Essence is to judge all others, and to be judg'd by none. As to what he says, that a Controversy, *Who this Infallible Judge is*, cou'd never yet be decided in the Church of Rome. I answer, *There never was any Controversy in the Church of Rome concerning what is of Faith in this Point, namely, That the Church is this Infallible Judge; and what the Church is, surely no R. Catholick ever disputed.*

Vol. iii. Object. 4. " If God had thought it neces-  
 Edit. post " sary, That there shou'd be an *Infallible*  
 Obic. Pa. " Church, He wou'd have reveal'd this very  
 32. " thing more plainly, than any particular  
 " Point whatsoever; but this He has not  
 " done; therefore He did not think it ne-  
 " cessary.

*Ans.* Let the Socinians, for once, answer, or rather retort this Argument upon the Dr. *Had God, say they, thought the Knowledge of Three Persons really Distinct, each of them Perfect God, and yet but One God, necessary to be believ'd by the Faithful, He would have reveal'd this very thing more plainly than any particular Point whatsoever, because it is look'd upon to be the chiefest Mystery of Christianity: But this He has not done; therefore He did not think it necessary to be believ'd.* Will the Dr. allow this Argument to be good? If not, I hope he will give me leave to have the same Thoughts of his Argument. For, I am certain, there is no

Text

Text in *Scripture*, that proves a real Distinction of Three Persons, whereof Each is Perfect God, and All but One God, so plainly, as it proves many other things, which are not so necessary to *Salvation*.

But has not God plainly reveal'd, That the Church is *Infallible*? Tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an *Heathen* or *Publican*. When the Spirit of Truth cometh, He shall guide you into all Truth. Go teach all Nations— And lo I am with you always even unto the End of the World. The Church is the Ground and Pillar of Truth. Are not all these clear and plain? Has not *Christ's* Own Mouth and His Apostle's reveal'd all these concerning the Church? Surely then, He judg'd the *Infallibility* of the Church necessary to be believ'd. And this is to a reasonable Man instead of a Thousand Arguments, that He thought it not only necessary, but even laid it down as the chief Fundamental Point of our Belief; because this once firmly establish'd, wou'd easily clear the Obscurity of any other.

Object. 5. " We have as great need of *In-* Page 77.  
" *fallible* Security against Sin and Vice, in  
" Matters of Practice, as against Errours in  
" Matters of Faith; but we have no *Infalli-*  
" *ble* Security against Sin and Vice, in Mat-  
" ters of Practice; consequently, nor a-  
" gainst Errours in Matters of Faith.

Ans. This Comparison is in one Sense just and reasonable, and in that Sense, I will be content to stand or fall by it, viz. That, as the Assistance of the H. Ghost infallibly se-  
cures

cures the Church from Errour; so the Assistance of God's Grace, together with the Co-operation of our Wills, which is always in our Power, is an Infallible Security against Sin, if put in use. For is not every Sin voluntary? And if voluntary, surely we may abstain from it; it wou'd not be voluntary else: For if we cannot abstain from it, it is no more voluntary, but necessary, and therefore no Sin; and have not we, in several Places of the Scripture, a Promise of the Assistance of God's Grace, which is never wanting to our sincere Endeavours; and if we have God's Grace, and are able, at least, by this Assistance to abstain from Sin; certainly we have an *Infallible* Security against Sin and Vice; or if we have it not, how can it stand with the Infinite Goodness of God to condemn us *eternally* for that, which we cannot avoid? In short, as it is most agreeable to His Infinite Goodness, and Mercy to condemn no Man for what he cannot help; so it is but reasonable we shou'd believe, he has given us such Means as will *infallibly* secure us, if it be not our own Fault, both from Errours in Matters of Faith; and from Sin and Vice, in Matters of Practice: But with this Difference, that Free-will, without which there can be no Reward or Punishment, by not co-operating with Grace, falls into Sin and Vice; whereas the Assistance of the *Holy Ghost* depending of no such Condition, as to its Effect, infallibly attains its End, and preserves the Church from Errour in Matters of Faith.

Object.



Object. 6. " All things necessary to be  
" known either in Faith or Practice, are  
" clear and plain in *Scripture*; therefore  
" there is no need of an *Infallible Church*.

*Ans.* This is a Fundamental Principle, I think, I may truly say, with all *Protestants*: The Dr. I am sure, repeats it several times, and lays great Stress upon it. But in establishing this Principle, he does Two things, which, I suppose, he wou'd not willingly allow of, had he but well consider'd them. 1. He makes any Man of Sense that can read the *Scripture*, as *infallible*, as the whole *Catholick Church* pretends to be. 2. He justifies, in a great measure, all the Hereticks that ever denied any Points of Faith, on pretence that they are not plain in *Scripture*.

1. *He makes any Man of Sense, that can read the Scriptures, as Infallible, as the whole Catholick Church pretends to be*: For the *Catholick Church* pretends only to be *Infallible* in necessary Articles of Faith: Now if all things, necessary to be known in Faith, and Practice, be clear and plain in *Scripture*; there is no Man of Sense, that reads it, but may be as *Infallible* in what is clear and plain, as any *Church* or *Churches* in the World: For what is clear and plain to a Man, that he is, as sure and certain of, as if all the Mathematicians in the World had demonstrated it to him; since a Demonstration serves for no other End, than to make a thing clear and plain. So that this worthy grave Doctor necessarily vests, in every Private Man, that *Infallibility*, which he endeavours with so much Earnestness

ness to deny to the whole *Catholick Church*. And surely, if One Single Man be *Infallible*, when he interprets *Scripture* concerning necessary Articles of Faith, how much surer can the same Privilege be ascrib'd to a Learned Assembly of Divines compos'd of the whole *Church*. The Dr. is then forc'd *volens nolens*, even by his own Principles, to admit an *Infallibility*.

2. He justifies, in a great measure, all the *Hereticks*, that ever denied any Points of Faith, on pretence that they are not plain in *Scripture*. For Instance; the *Socinians* are generally Men of Learning, and their ingenious Writings do sufficiently witness to the World, they want neither Sense, nor Judgment; yet they solemnly declare, they do not find One Text in *Scripture*, which proves clearly, and plainly the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, or a *Trinity of Persons* in One God, in a true and proper Sense; which notwithstanding is One of the greatest Mysteries of our Faith. What must we say of these Men? Can we imagine they wou'd be so great Enemies to their own *Salvation*, as to deny this great Mystery, if it were clearly and plainly set down in *Scripture*? And if it be not, with what Face can *Protestants* condemn the *Socinians*, who openly profess to follow their Principles; and do, for that very reason, reject this Mystery, because it is not plain in *Scripture*? Or how will they be able to convince them upon this Principle; since they are ready, as they have often declar'd, to believe the Mystery of the *Trinity*, if it cou'd be made out, that  
it

it is clearly, and plainly contain'd in the *Scripture* ? But why do I say convince them ? Alas ! They are so far from any such thing, that the absurd and ridiculous Systems of many of their Doctors, in their Answers to the acute and ingenious Pamphlets of these Hereticks proclaim loudly to the World, that the *Socinians* have got the better, and fairly beat them at their own Weapons. And thus in rejecting the Authority of the *Church*, which *Christ* commands us to hear, on no less Penalty, than of being reputed *Heathens and Publicans* ; they have open'd a Door for these, and all other Sects, who are daily cutting their Throats with those very Weapons themselves have put into their Hands.

---

C H A P. III.

*Of the Pope's Supremacy.*

**W**HAT we believe to be of Faith concerning this Point ; is this, *That the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, is the Successour of S. Peter, and, as such, Head of the Catholick Church.*

That the *Bishop of Rome* is Successour of *St. Peter*, I hope, I need not prove, since there is nothing in History more universally attested by all Ancient and Modern Writers : Nor was it ever yet question'd, that I cou'd find, till some *Protestants* in this, and in the last Age, without the least Grounds in Antiquity, had the Assurance to dispute it ; whose Opinions notwithstanding are exploded by most of their own Learned Writers. See *Dr. Cave* in the *Life of S. Peter*. The



The main Business then is to shew, that this Prerogative was conferr'd upon S. Peter. And for this we have several Texts of Scripture, in which it is plain.

1. That Christ conferr'd this Dignity upon him.

2. That the Evangelist giving the Names of the Twelve Apostles, marks particularly his Primacy. And,

3. That after Christ's Ascension, he took upon him this Character, always speaking first, and moving to the rest of the Apostles whatever was to be debated.

1. Christ conferr'd this Dignity upon him. I say unto thee that thou art Peter, or as the Greek has it, a Rock, and upon this Rock I will build My Church. Jesus said to Simon Peter. Simon Son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these. And a little after, Feed My Lambs; again, Feed My Sheep—Feed My Sheep. And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desir'd to have you, that he may sift you as Wheat; but I have pray'd for thee, that thy Faith fail not; and when thou art converted, confirm thy Brethren. The English Translators (carrying, no doubt, an Eye upon this Controversy) have rendr'd it, Strengthen thy Brethren; because a Charge of confirming others does too plainly denote a Superiority.

Mat. xvi.  
John xxi.  
Luk. xxii.  
31, 32.

I shall make no other Reflections upon these Texts only, desire the Reader to observe, that this particular pointing out of Peter, as a Rock, to build the Church upon; the especial Charge of Feeding Christ's Lambs and Sheep, by which the Holy Fathers have always understood

derstood both People and Pastors; and the Confirming of his Brethren, viz. The rest of the Apostles, must, surely, denote some particular Mark and Character above the rest.

2. The Evangelist, in giving the Names of the 12 Apostles, marks particularly St. Peter's Primacy. Now the Names of the 12 Apostles are these; the First Simon who is called Peter. 'Tis certain, that Peter was not the First Disciple of the 12, nor yet the Eldest Man; for his Brother Andrew was sooner a Disciple, and older than Peter. And most certainly, Christ did not design the  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  for A Primacy of Ceremony or Civility, but for that of Order and Jurisdiction; at least, as far as it was requisite to found the Peace and Unity of the Church.

Mt. x.

3. After Christ's Ascension, Peter took upon him this Character. Acts of the Apostles, Cap. i. He stands up, discourses at large upon the Fall of Judas; and lays before the Apostles, and Disciples, the Necessity of substituting another in his room. Ch. ii. When the Disciples were fill'd with the H. Ghost, and spoke with other Tongues, and the Multitude thought they were drunk; Peter lifts up his Voice, and gives an account of that miraculous Gift. His Speech in the Temple. Ch. iii. His Defence before the Rulers, and Elders in Jerusalem. Ch. iv. His Sentence upon Ananias and Saphira, Ch. v. And many other Passages to this purpose found in the same Volume, are convincing Proofs of this Truth; but more especially that famous Council of the Apostles related Chap. xv. Where after much

much disputing, *Peter* rose up first, shew'd the Apostles what Conduct they were to keep in regard of the Converted Gentiles, and concluded, in a manner, the Debate with this Sentence: *Now therefore, why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers, nor we, were able to bear, &c.* So that if we had never been taught any thing else, concerning *Peter's Primacy*, his Conduct in these Affairs were enough for any unprejudic'd Man to conclude, that either he was qualified by *Jesus Christ* for that Office, or that he must be a very arrogant Man in taking so much upon him, to the Diminution of the Honour and Esteem of his Fellow Apostles. And if we put these 3 things together, viz. 1. *Christ's building His Church upon Peter; giving him the Charge of feeding His Lambs and Sheep; and the Power of confirming his Brethren.* 2. *The Evangelist, pursuant to this Power, not only reckoning him First amongst the Apostles, but also calling him the First.* 3. *Peter's exercising the Office, and Charge of Head, or Chief amongst the Apostles, as aforesaid;* we shall plainly see, that this Superiority is no imaginary thing, as our Adversaries wou'd make the World believe; but a real Truth grounded upon the Word of God. And if this was conferr'd upon *Peter*, it is granted by all, that the same Prerogative must necessarily devolve upon his Lawful Successours, the Bishops of *Rome*. And, indeed, this was so publickly taught, and profess'd by the Primitive Fathers and Councils, as a Necessary and Fundamental Truth,



Truth, that many Learned *Protestants* have been forc'd to own it. I shall instance in One; Monsieur *Blondel*, one of the most Learned *Protestants*, that ever writ against the Pope's Supremacy, gives it this Testimony. *The Titles of the Apostle St. Peter*, saith he, ought not to be put in Debate, since the Grecians, and *Protestants* also do confess, that it has been believ'd, and that it might indeed be, that he was the President and Head of the Apostles, the Foundation of the Church, and Possessor of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Again, Rome being a Church consecrated by the Residence and Martyrdome of St. Peter, whom Antiquity has acknowledged to be the Head of the College Apostolick, having been honour'd with the Title of the Seat of the Apostle S. Peter, might without Difficulty, be consider'd, by one of the most renowned Councils, (viz. That of Chalcedon) as Head of the Church. Thus far this Learned Man; and surely, nothing, but the Evidence of this Truth, cou'd extort so ingenious a Confession from an Adversary, in favour of Rome, whose Supremacy he chiefly aim'd to pull down. Now, how far this Title gives him Superiority, and Jurisdiction over all other Bishops, I will not take upon me to determine. This only I shall undertake to prove, that the Fathers of the Primitive Church did believe St. Peter and his Successors, the Bishops of Rome, to be by virtue of this Prerogative; St. Peter, Head, and Chief amongst the Apostles, and the Bishop of Rome, the same among all other Bishops, and Center of Catholick Unity; and that

the *Bishop of Rome* did exercise Jurisdiction, as Occasion offer'd, over the Eastern, as well as the Western Bishops, even in the Primitive Times, such as *Excommunication, Receiving of Appeals, Confirming and deposing of Bishops, &c.* For the Truth of all which we have, besides the general Consent of the Church, as Authentick Records, next to the *Scripture*, as for any Matter of Fact whatsoever happening at so great a Distance. I shou'd never end, if I shou'd cite all the Passages of Fathers, and Councils, and Ecclesiastical Writers, which may be brought to prove this Point. I will therefore instance in a few only, but they shall be such as will by the Greatness of their Authority, and Clearness of Expression, I hope, be abundantly sufficient to compose this Difference. And

1. *St. Irenæus* speaks thus of the Church of Rome; *Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potentio rem Principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, Eos qui undique sunt Fideles.* Every Church, that is, The Faithful on every Side, must have recourse to this Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality. Lib. iii. C. iii.

2. *St. Cyprian* thus, of *S. Peter*; *Hoc erat utique ceteri Apostoli quod erat Petrus pari Consortio præditi & Potestatis, & Honoris,— Primatus tamen Petro datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia & Cathedra una monstretur.* The rest of the Apostles were the same that *S. Peter* was, endued with a like Fellowship of Power and Honour,— Yet the Primacy is given to *Peter*, that the One Church of Christ, and One Chair might appear, Lib. de Unitat. Eccles.

3. S. Ambrose. *Andreas prius secutus est Dominum quam Petrus, tamen Principatum non accepit Andreas sed Petrus. Andrew follow'd Christ sooner than Peter, yet Andrew did not receive the Principality, but Peter, in 2 Cor. xii.*

4. S. Jerom. *Propterea inter Duodecim Unus eligitur, ut Capite constituto Schismatis tollatur Occasio. One is chosen among the Twelve (Apostles) to the end that, a Head being constituted, all Occasion of Schism may be taken away, Cont. Jovin.*

5. St. Chrysostome. *The Pastor and Head of the Church was a Fisherman. Hom. lv. in Cap. xvi. Mat.*

6. S. Augustine. *In Ecclesia Romana semper viguit Apostolicæ Cathedræ Principatus. The Principality of the Apostolick Chair has always flourish'd in the Church of Rome, Epist. clxii.*

7. The General Council of Chalcedon. *We thoroughly consider, that all Primacy and chief Honour is to be kept for the Bishop of Old Rome. Act. xvi. This was the general Language not only of the Fathers of this Council, but even of all Antiquity, both in Publick Assemblies and Private Writings; the Primitive Fathers and Councils always deferring the chief Honour and Primacy to the See of S. Peter, as they generally phrase it.*

*And indeed, tho' the Bishops of Constantinople have always been observ'd to be very ambitious to advance their own See above all others, and to have procur'd in Two General Councils, viz. In the First Council of Constantinople, and in that of Chalcedon, to have that See preferr'd to Alexandria, and*



*Antioch*, and plac'd next after *Rome*; yet we do not find, that any Council, or Father did ever dispute with the *Bishop of Rome* in Point of Primacy or Jurisdiction; in so much was all Antiquity persuaded, and convinc'd that he was the *Chief and Supreme Visible Head of the whole Catholick Church*. Thus much concerning the Primacy of *St. Peter* and his Successours, which yet is not the One Half of what may be alledg'd for this Point.

Now I wou'd willingly beg of any of our Adversaries to answer me to these few Queries: *Whether these Holy Fathers did not believe the Primacy of St. Peter, and his Successours, when they spoke so plainly in favour of it? Whether they did not understand, and were well instructed in the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church, touching this Point? Whether they had a mind to flatter the Bishop of Rome, or to grant him any more Authority, and Power over themselves, than was justly due to him? And whether it be not an Excess of Folly and Weakness (to say no worle) in the Protestants, now, 1500 Years after, to dispute that Prerogative which is so manifestly acknowledg'd, by so many eminent Martyrs and Confessours, and great Doctors of the Primitive Church.*

That the *Bishop of Rome* did exercise Jurisdiction, by way of Excommunication, over the Eastern Bishops (of which alone if there remains any Difficulty) we have, besides, innumerable Examples from the 4th to the 10th Century, as that, for Instance, *Innocent the First* excommunicated, *Theophilus*, *Bishop of Alexandria*; *Celestinus the First*, *Ne-*

*storius*

*Storius* of *Constantinople*; *Agapitus*, *Anthimius*, another Bishop of *Constantinople*; *Nicholas the First*, *Phorius* the intruded Bishop of *Constantinople*; besides these, I say, we have Two memorable Facts to this purpose, in the Beginning of the Second, and about the Middle of the Third Century. The First is related by Two eminent Witnesses, *St. Irenæus*, and *Eusebius Casariensis*; by *S. Irenæus*, in a Letter to this *Pope Victor*; and by *Eusebius* in his *Ecclesiastical History*, *Lib. v. Cap. xxxv.* This Historian tells us, that *Victor Bishop of Rome*, excommunicated *Polycrates*, and the rest of the *Asiatick Bishops*; because they would not be induced to celebrate *Easter* after the *Roman Custom*. And *S. Irenæus* in his Letter to this *Pope*, complains most grievously of his Severity in cutting off so many Members from the Body of the Church, for a Matter of Discipline, which no way respected the Faith. 'Tis true, *S. Irenæus* and *Eusebius* do not approve of *Victor's* Proceedings in this Business; because they look'd upon his Sentence to be too severe; yet neither the one, nor the other, did ever say, that *Victor* had no power to do so: And as *St. Irenæus* took the liberty to reprehend the *Pope*, for his too great Severity, as he thought, in this Matter; so, no doubt, he wou'd have told him, that he exceeded his Commission, by such a Procedure, if he had not been convinc'd, that the like Power had been vested in him. And most certainly, *Eusebius*, who was an *Asiatick Bishop* himself, wou'd never have complimented the *Bishop of*

*Rome*, but wou'd have plainly here inserted, that the *Pope* had no power to excommunicate the *Bishops of Asia*, had there been the least question of his Authority in that Particular.

The Second, is that famous Controversy between *Pope Stephen* and *S. Cyprian*, touching the Baptism conferr'd by Hereticks. Many Learned Writers are of opinion, that *S. Stephen* excommunicated *S. Cyprian*, and his Adherents; and all do agree, that he threaten'd at last to excommunicate them: Yet we do not find, that *S. Cyprian*, or any other Ecclesiastical Writer did ever say, that the *Bishop of Rome* exceeded his Power in so doing: 'Tis true, *S. Cyprian*, and his Adherents, as well as the *Asiatick Bishops*, persisted in their Error, notwithstanding the *Pope's* Excommunication, as it usually falls out, Men being hardly ever dissuaded from the Opinions they once undertake to maintain; but the *Council of Nice* has justified the *Pope's* Conduct in both these Particulars, branding with Heresy such as maintain'd the said Error.

That there were Appeals made to the *Bishop of Rome*, by the Eastern Bishops, is no less manifest: *S. Athanasius*, and *Paul, Bishop of Constantinople*, appeal'd to *Pope Julius* for Redress of the Violence offer'd them by the *Arians*; *St. Chrysostome*, to *Innocent the First*; *Theodoretus* to *Leo*; besides many more which I shall at present omit.

*Socrates*, a famous Ecclesiastical Writer of the Primitive Times, tells us, *Lib. ii. Cap. xv.* How *S. Athanasius*, and *Paul*, with several



veral other Bishops came to *Rome*, and complain'd to *Julius* of the Violence offer'd them by the *Arians*, and how he had undertaken their Patronage. Among other things, he adds this, concerning the *Pope's* Authority in this Particular. ὁ δὲ ἂν προνομίαν τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκκλησίας ἐχὼς παρρησιαστικῶς γεγραμμένην ὡχύρωσεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνατολὴν ὅπως ἔλλει τὸν οἰκῶν ἐκείνῳ τόπον ἀποδίδας καὶ καταπατόμενος τῆς περὶ τῶς κατελόντων αὐτοῦ. But he (the Pope) because the Church of Rome had that Privilege, warranted them with his Letters, wherein he freely spoke his Mind, and sent them back to the East, restoring each to his own Place, and severely reprehending those, who rashly turn'd them out.

The Learned *Theodoretus* informs us, that St. *Athanasius*, being a second time, turn'd out by the *Arians*, appeal'd again to *Rome*. And that *Pope Julius* following the Canon of the Church, commanded the *Arians* to come to *Rome*, and cited *Athanasius* to appear at his Consistory. ὁ δὲ τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπομένῳ νόμῳ καὶ αὐτοῦ καταλαχεῖν τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκέλευσε, καὶ τὸν δεῖον Ἀθανάσιον εἰς τὴν δίκην ἐκέλευσε.

*Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. Cap. iv*

Let us now put both these Testimonies together: Here are Two of the greatest Bishops of the East violently thrust out of their Bishopricks, and flying to the Bishop of *Rome* for Redress: Here are Two of the most famous, and most eminent Historians of Antiquity, who tell us, that the Church of *Rome* had a peculiar Privilege to protect and restore Bishops: That the Bishop of *Rome* did but act according to, or follow the Canon, or Law of the Church, as *Theodoretus* words

## The Pope's Supremacy.

it, when he commanded the *Arians* to appear before him, and summon'd *Athanasius* to answer their Charge. If these be not Acts of Legal Jurisdiction; if this be not the formal and proper Process of an Appeal, we are, as yet to learn the Meaning of these Terms.

*Palladius*, Bishop of *Helionopolis*, in the Life of *St. Chrysostome*, tells us, that this Great Patriarch sent Four Bishops to *Rome* to plead his Cause; and we have Two Letters of *Theodoretus* setting forth his Appeal to the Bishop of *Rome*; the First, to the Pope; and the Second, to *Renatus*, Dean, or Arch-deacon of the Church of *Rome*; in which he has these Words: *They have spoil'd me of my Bishoprick; they did not reverence my Age consum'd in Religion, nor my Grey Hairs: Wherefore I beseech you to persuade the most Holy Archbishop to use his Apostolick Authority, and to command us to come to your Consistory; for that Holy See sitteth at the Helm, and hath the Government of the whole World.*

Besides all these, we have an exprefs Canon of the General Council of *Sardica* held in, or about the Year 347, wherein it is manifestly decreed, That if any Bishop be accus'd, or condemn'd, or depriv'd of his Bishoprick, by the Bishops of his Province; and that the Bishop thus depriv'd will appeal, or fly to the Bishop of *Rome*, and desire to be heard; the Bishop of *Rome* may either commit the Cognizance of his Cause to the Bishops of the Neighbouring Province, or send Legates cloath'd with his own Authority to be present at the Judgment, or do whatever shall seem best, in that behalf, to his own  
most

*most prudent Counsel.* Now let any impartial Man judge, if the single Authority of this Council be not sufficient to establish the Pope's Authority, in point of Appeals, tho' there were nothing else to prove it.

That the *Bishop of Rome* exercis'd Jurisdiction over the Eastern Bishops, by way of Confirmation, and Deposition, is too well known to need much Proof. *St. Leo* tells us, *Epist. xiii.* That he was earnestly desir'd by *Theodosius* the Emperour, to confirm *Anatolius Bishop of Constantinople*, which yet he refus'd to do, unless *Anatolius* had first profess'd the same Doctrine with *Cyrillus*, and the rest of the *Catholick Bishops* in opposition to the *Heresy of Nestorius*. The same *Pope* gives us to understand in his *Epist. lxxxii.* That he had constituted the *Bishop of Thessalonica*, as his Vicegerent in that part of the East, for the Confirmation and Deposition of Bishops, and for such other Acts of Jurisdiction as depended of the *Apostolick See*. I might bring more Instances to this purpose, from the most approv'd Writers of Ancient and Modern History; but let these suffice for the Proof of a thing so universally attested by all Antiquity.

And now, if neither plain Texts of *Scripture*, declaring this Prerogative to have been conferr'd upon *S. Peter*, and plainly shewing his exercising of it, on several Occasions; nor the Authority of so many Holy Fathers, and Councils of the Primitive Times, manifestly differing the same Privilege to his Successours; nor the Testimony of Two of the  
most



most celebrated Historians of Antiquity, publicly witnessing, That the *Church of Rome* had the Privilege to hear and restore the Patriarchs, and Bishops of the East, and that the *Bishop of Rome* follow'd or acted according to the Laws of the Church, when he commanded or cited the Eastern Bishops, Patriarch and all, to appear before him; nor yet the Consent, which the Evidence of the thing has extorted from some Ingenious, and Learned *Protestants* in favour of this Truth: If all this, I say, will not open our Adversaries Eyes to see the *Pope's Supremacy*; all I can do for their Service, is to pray to Almighty God, that He would be pleas'd to take away from their Hearts that Veil of Prejudice, which hinders them to see so manifest a Truth. But of this enough; let us now see the Objections.

- Vol. vi. Against this Tenet the Doctor objects.  
 Page 155. " 1. That the *Bishop of Rome*, as *Successeur*  
 " of *St. Peter* there, cannot be the *Supreme*  
 " and *Universal Pastor of Christ's Church*, by  
 " Divine Appointment; because, saith he,  
 " *There is not the least mention of this in Scrip-*  
 Page 156. " ture. 2. That it is against Reason to  
 " found the *Pope's Supremacy* in being *Succef-*  
 " *sour of St. Peter at Rome*; whereas it should  
 " rather pertain to the *Bishop of Antioch*,  
 " where *Peter* was first Bishop.

To the First, I answer, That, by all these Titles, is only meant, that the *Pope* is *Head of the Church*, and the *Center of Catholick Unity*; and no more is requir'd of any Man to believe concerning this Point. Now, that there

there is not only Mention, but even *Texts of Scripture* clearly proving St. Peter (whose undoubted Successour all the World knows to be the *Bishop of Rome*) to have been made the *Head of the Church of Christ* is already made out. 'Tis true, the *Scripture* makes no mention of these Words, *Supreme and Universal Pastor*; no more does it of the Word *Consubstantial*, yet the Fathers of the *Nicene Council* did not scruple to make a Fundamental Article of Faith of it, and carefully inserted it in their Creed; because they judg'd it very proper to express their Belief, concerning the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*.

In like manner, tho' some *Catholick Writers* call the *Bishop of Rome, Supreme and Universal Pastor, &c.* yet I do not see what Grounds the Dr. had to quarrel with them for that; since all *Catholicks* agree, that they mean nothing else by these Words, but that the *Pope* is *Head of the Church*, and use them for no other End, than to express more fully what it is to be *Head of the Church*. But 'tis very remarkable that no Sect ever separated from the Church, who did not follow this Maxim. They take hold of some Words invented by the Church, to declare more expressly such Articles of Faith, as were contested; and because these very Terms are not found in *Scripture*, they cry immediately Victory; as if our Faith consisted meerly in Words, and not in what is meant by them.

To the Second, I answer, That it is much more against Reason, nay altogether absurd,  
to

to imagine, that *St. Peter* (whom the Dr. as well as I, must, in this Case, suppose to be *Head of the Church*) shou'd come to *Rome*, place his Chair in that City, and yet leave his Authority behind him at *Antioch*. This airy Notion, I am sure, none of the Holy Fathers and Councils in the Primitive Times ever thought of; on the contrary, they have always consider'd the *Bishop of Rome* as *Successour of St. Peter, Head of the Church, and Principle of Catholick Unity*.

There are several Objections more of this nature in the same Volume, *Pag. 244, 245, &c.* And tho' most of them are levell'd at the *Church of Rome*, yet I chuse to take notice of them under this Head, rather than the former; both because of their Affinity with this, and for the Reader's Satisfaction, who, I suppose, won't be sorry to find them answer'd in the same Order they lie.

1. The Doctor grants that, *If the Roman Church be the Catholick Church, it is necessary to be of that Communion, because* (saith he) *out of the Catholick Church there is ordinarily no Salvation to be had. But how do they prove* (continues he) *that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church? They wou'd fain have us to be so civil as to take it for granted, because if we do not, they do not well know how to go about to prove it.* And after some pleasant Sal-lies of Raillery, he concludes, that to prove a Part to be the Whole, is all one, as to prove, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholick Church*.

To answer this Objection, I say, *First, That the Dr. here does very courteously ju-*  
stifie



stifie the *Roman Catholicks* from that odious Imputation of *Uncharitableness*, wherewith he elſewhere moſt grievouſly charges them, for not allowing *Proteſtants Salvation* out of their Communion. He grants, That out of the Catholick Church there is ordinarily no Salvation to be had: Now the *Roman Catholicks* do ſincerely believe that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholick Church*; conſequently, when they ſay, That there is ordinarily no Salvation out of it, they cannot juſtly be charg'd with the leaſt *Uncharitableness*; ſince they have, as it is already prov'd, the greateſt *Aſſurance* for that Belief, that any thing of that nature is capable of. And if it be true, as moſt certainly it is, that the *Roman Church* is the *C. Church*; then ſurely the *Roman Catholicks* are ſo far from being uncharitable in this Particular, that it is one of the greateſt Marks of their Charity to have that Love for their erring Brethren, as to mind them of the hazard they run, and exhort them to avoid it; tho' they are ſure they ſhall be hated for their Pains. 2dly, That he muſt be a great Stranger to our Divines and Controvertiſts, if he thinks as he here writes; They do not well know how to go about to prove it. Surely he muſt have been very ill read in the Writings of *Bellarmin*, *Peron*, *Richelieu*, and Hundreds of *Catholick Divines*, who wrote on this Subject, when he advances ſo groundleſs (ſhall I call it) a Story: And what as yet renders the thing more intolerable is, That this is ſpoken out of a Pulpit, where nothing but Truth and Sincerity, ſhou'd as much

much as be mention'd. In short, this is Matter of Fact: The *Catholick Divines* Books, on this Subject, are still extant; and let even our Adversaries be the Judges, whether this be not one of the most groundless Mistakes that ever any serious Man cou'd fall into. 3dly, That he is as far out, when he says, That to prove a Part to be the Whole, is all one, as to prove the *Roman Church* to be the *C. Church*. Had we said, that the particular *Church* and *Diocess* of *Rome* were the *Catholick Church*, his Comparison wou'd then indeed, have been reasonable; but, surely, he cou'd not be ignorant, that we understand, by the *Roman Church*, all the *Christian Churches* over the World in communion with the particular *Church* and *See* of *Rome*; which we therefore call the *Roman Catholick Church*, because *Rome* being the *Seat* of *S. Peter's Successour*, is the *Center* and *Principle* of *Catholick Unity*.

If the Dr. had a mind to make good his *Thesis*, he shou'd have prov'd, that all other Societies of *Christians*, who are not in communion with the *Church* of *Rome*, are, notwithstanding their Heresies and Schisms, a Part of the *Catholick Church*; he shou'd have prov'd, that the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, which take up the greatest part of the *Eastern Christians*, are a Part of the *Catholick Church*, notwithstanding they were excommunicated, and cut off from the Body of the *Catholick Church*, by the Lawful Authority of Two General Councils, whose Decrees he, and all other Learned *Protestants* do profess

to embrace; that the *Grecians* are still *Members of the C. Church*, notwithstanding their wilful Schism from its Communion; their ancient Error concerning the Procession of the *H. Ghost*; their having been so often Reconcil'd and United to it, yet still returning to their Vomit; but more especially their self-condemn'd Perverseness in their late Separation from the Communion and Fellowship of the *Church of Rome*, which they solemnly, and in the most authentick Manner, gave under their Hands, in the *Council of Florence*, they wou'd hold and maintain; he shou'd have prov'd, that *Luther, Calvin*, and all those, who adher'd to their new broach'd Opinions, are a Part of the *Catholick Church*, notwithstanding their being excommunicated by the Church, and their own Confession of holding these Opinions in opposition to all the World besides: All this, I say, the Dr. shou'd have prov'd to shew, that the *Roman Church* is but a Part of the *Catholick Church*: But neither he, nor any Body else did ever so much as attempt it; on the contrary, most of the *Learned Men of the Church of England* have readily given up the Cause in regard of all the aforesaid Sects; and most of all other Sects do as censoriously condemn those of the *Church of England*: With what Colour of Reason then can the Dr. suggest, that the *Roman Church* is but a Part of the *Catholick Church*? Nay, can any thing be more plain, than that the *Roman Church*, as it is understood by *Catholicks*, is the whole *Catholick Church*; since none of the aforesaid Sects



Sects can, with the least Colour of Reason, pretend to be a Part of it; since they themselves do unchurch one another; since they own, that the *Church of Rome* is a Part, at least, of the *Catholick Church*, and that One Faith and One Communion are equally essential to the Being, or Constitution of the *One Catholick Church*; in both which Essentials they own themselves to be different from the *Church of Rome*. So that, if we had no other Proof besides, this last Reason is a plain Demonstration, that either the *Church of Rome* is the whole *Catholick Church*, or that it is no Part or Member of it.

'Tis a known Truth, and even vouch'd by all *Protestants* whatsoever, that the *Church of Rome* is, at least, a Part of the *Catholick Church*: That One Faith, and One Communion are equally essential to the Constitution of the *Catholick Church of Christ*, is a Doctrine generally received by the *Church of England*; and, I suppose, by all the Divines in the World besides; now there is none of all the aforesaid Sects, as they all unanimously agree, that holds either the same Faith, or Communion with the *Church of Rome*, which yet they hold to be a Part of the *Catholick Church*, and which together with the said Sects made up the whole *Body of Christians*. It is then most evident, that either the *Church of Rome* is the whole *Catholick Church*, or that it is no Part or Member of it. But the Latter no *Protestant* ever yet durst affirm; for if they shou'd affirm, that the *Church of Rome* is no part of the *Catholick*

Lick

lick Church, this would vacate all their Pretences to be a Church; since it is from the Church of Rome they pretend to derive their Mission, Ordination, and Spiritual Power, if any they have. We are then sure, even to a Demonstration, that, if what the Protestants say be true, the Roman Church is the whole Catholick Church; and no less sure, that neither the Protestants, nor any other Sect whatsoever, can be any Part or Member of the Catholick Church whilst they continue out of the Communion, and Faith of the Roman Church.

2. To prove the Roman Church to be the Catholick Church, the Doctor requires the following Particulars shou'd be clearly shewn, and made out.

1. A plain Constitution of our Saviour, whereby S. Peter, and his Successours at Rome, are made the Supreme Head, and Pastors of the whole Christian Church. Of this, says he, We have not the least Intimation in the Gospel, nor in the Acts, and Epistles of the Apostles; nay, there is clear Evidence, adds he, to the contrary, that in the Council of Jerusalem, St. James was, if not superiour, at least equal to him. And St. Paul, upon several Occasions, declares himself equal to St. Peter. But suppose it were true, continues the Doctor, that St. Peter were Head of the Church; where doth it appear, that this Authority was derived to his Successours? And if it were; why to his Successours at Rome, rather than at Antioch, where he was first and unquestionably Bishop?

H

Ans.

*Ans.* Touching a plain Constitution, &c. Methinks a modest good *Christian* might well be content with One plain *Text* of *Scripture* produc'd to that purpose, much more with a great many; and this surely is already done a Hundred times over, both from the Gospel, and Acts of the Apostles; where we plainly find this Charge committed to St. *Peter*, and his frequent Exercise of it as Occasion offer'd.

'Tis true, the *Scripture* makes no mention of his Successour at *Rome*: Nor do we say, it is necessary, he shou'd be there rather than any where else: For St. *Peter* might, if he pleas'd, for ought we know, have as well plac'd his Chair in *Canterbury*; but it is Matter of Fact, that he did not place it there, but in *Rome*. His making St. *James* equal, if not superiour to St. *Peter* in the Council of *Jerusalem*, needs no other Confutation than a bare Recital of the Matter of Fact, which pass'd there. I am sure it is as plain, as Words can make it, that St. *Peter* rose up first, open'd the Subject of their Meeting, discours'd upon the Conversion of the Gentiles by his Ministry, shew'd the Unreasonableness of that Yoke the Jews wou'd fain put upon them, and concluded with a peremptory Sentence to that purpose: which 'tis manifest, S. *James*, and the rest did but follow; and if this be not sufficient Evidence of his Superiority, even over S. *James*, let the World judge. As for St. *Paul's* declaring himself equal to S. *Peter*, it moves me not: For so may any Bishop lawfully



fully ordain'd do to the *Pope*, without the least Diminution of his *Supremacy*: The Equality meant by *S. Paul* respecting only the Power of preaching the Word of God to those, to whom he was sent; of administering the Sacraments, and of ordaining Ministers for the Use and Benefit of the Faithful: To do all which, I readily grant, every Apostle's Power to be equal to *St. Peter's*; and every lawfully ordain'd Bishop's, to that of the *Pope's*. As to his Question; *Where doth it appear that St. Peter's Power was derived to his Successours?* I am almost unwilling to honour it with a Confutation; being, in my Sense, one of the simplest Expressions that ever dropp'd from a Man of his Parts. If I shou'd ask, *Where doth it appear, that he was by Divine Institution, Archbishop of Canterbury?* I believe he wou'd be puzzled a little, to give a good Answer? Yet he did not scruple to style himself *John, by the Grace of God, Archbishop of Canterbury*. Did ever any Man question, whether the Authority and Power of the Bishop of any See was deriv'd to his Successour? Was not *Christ's* Power deriv'd to his Apostles? *As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you*. Was not the Apostles Power deriv'd to their Successours? Else how cou'd we pretend to be *Christians*? In short, that Heirs and Successours shou'd inherit the Power and Authority of their Ancestours, unless there be a positive Law, or Exception to the contrary, is surely a self-evident Maxim grafted in our Hearts by the Law of Nature, and confirm'd by the com-

## The Pope's Supremacy.

mon Consent of Mankind : What shou'd then hinder *Peter's* Authority to be deriv'd to his Successours, whom all the World, before the Rise of *Protestantism* did believe to be the *Bishops of Rome*, and not those of *Antioch*, as the Doctor seems here to suggest.

2. To make good, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholick Church*, they are oblig'd to affirm, says the Dr. " That the Churches of " *Asia*, and *Africa*, which were excommuni- " cated by the *Bishops of Rome*, for celebra- " ting *Easter* after the *Jewish* Manner, and " upon the Point of rebaptizing Hereticks, " were cut off from the *Catholick Church*, " and from a Possibility of *Salvation*. This " the *Church of Rome* themselves will not af- " firm, continues he, and yet if to be cast " out of the Communion of the *Roman*, " and the *Catholick Church* be all one, they " must affirm it.

*Ans.* This Argument is grounded upon a Fallacy; and therefore the Inference is false. Had the *Bishop of Rome* and the *Roman Church* been convertible Terms, the Inference wou'd then, indeed, have been right, and the Arguments true; but surely Dr. *Tillotson* knew very well, we never understood these Terms so. The Fallacy then consists in this, That he joins together the Two different Notions of *Roman Church*, and *Bishop of Rome*, and makes them pass for one and the same thing; and so, by a cunning Piece of Sophistry, concludes that whatever is done by the *Bishop of Rome*, is likewise the Act and Deed of the whole *Roman Church*.

3. " In consequence of this Proposition,  
 " That *the Church of Rome is the Catholick*  
 " Church, they ought to hold, that all Bap-  
 " tism out of the Communion of their  
 " Church, is void and of none Effect. For  
 " if it be good, pursues the Doctor, then it  
 " makes the Persons baptis'd *Members of*  
 " *the Catholick Church*; and then those, that  
 " are out of the Communion of the *Roman*  
 " Church, may be true *Members of the Ca-*  
 " *tholick Church*: And then the *Roman*, and  
 " the *Catholick Church* are not all one. But  
 " the *Church of Rome* holds the Baptism of  
 " Hereticks to be good; consequently the  
 " *Roman Church* is not the *Catholick Church*.

*Ans.* His Inference is likewise here false,  
 and so is his Consequence. The *Roman Catho-*  
*licks* following the Ancient Fathers, and  
 Councils of the Primitive Church, do believe,  
 that the Baptism conferr'd by Hereticks,  
 with due Matter, and Form is good, and va-  
 lid; and that it makes the Baptis'd true *Mem-*  
*bers of the Catholick*, and consequently of the  
*Roman Church*; provided there be no Impe-  
 diment of Heresy, or Schism on the part of  
 the Persons thus baptis'd; but if they are  
 engag'd in any Heresy, or Schism, they hold,  
 indeed, that they receive a true Character  
 of Baptism; but this alone neither makes  
 them *Members of the Catholick Church*, nor a-  
 vails any thing to their *Salvation*: For, as St.  
*Austin* says, all the Sacraments may be had  
 out of the Church, but *Salvation* cannot.  
 Now the Dr. to make good this Inference,  
 shou'd do these Two things. 1. *He shou'd have*



## The Pope's Supremacy.

prov'd, that *Infants, and such as are not capable of Heresy, or Schism, being baptis'd by Hereticks, are out of the Communion of the Roman Church*: For this we utterly deny, and on the contrary, affirm they are true Members of it, until they forsake or renounce it, by actual Profession of Heresy, or by Schism. 2. *That those who are actually engag'd in Heresy or Schism, being baptis'd in that State, and persisting in it, are notwithstanding, by virtue of their Baptism, made true Members of the Catholick Church.* Cou'd the Dr. but prove this, he wou'd, I own, both gain his Point, and render glorious Service to several Thousands of ancient Hereticks, who deny'd the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, as well as to the present *Protestants*, by making them, all true *Members of the Catholick Church*, in spite of all the General Councils, and their Authority. But alas! This is what neither he, nor any Body else will ever attempt. And indeed, if it were possible to be effected, we shou'd, I am sure, be as glad of it, and as willing to contribute to the *Salvation* of these Men, as he, or any Body else; but we have learn'd from the Word of God, and from the Principles of true Charity, not to flatter any Society of Men with a false Peace, and Security, when we have no Grounds for it.

4. " In consequence of this Proposition,  
 " all the *Christians* in the World, which do  
 " not yield Subjection to the *Bishop of Rome*,  
 " and acknowledge his *Supremacy*, are no  
 " true Parts of the *Catholick Church*, nor in  
 " a Possibility of *Salvation*. And this does not  
 " only

“ only exclude those of the *Reform'd Religi-*  
 “ *on* from being *Members of the Catholick*  
 “ *Church*; but the *Greeks*, and the *Eastern*  
 “ *Churches*; (*i. e.*) Four of the Five Patri-  
 “ archal Churches of the *Christian World*.  
 Hence the Doctor concludes, that the *Roman*  
*Church*, is not the *Catholick Church*; because it  
 has not more Charity than this comes to.

*Ans.* This Argument is founded upon an  
 Inconveniency; and a great Inconvenience,  
 I confess, it is; but if we shou'd conclude the  
 Existence, or Non-existence; the Truth, or  
 Falshood of things from their Conveniency  
 or Inconveniency; the World wou'd be  
 brought to a fine Pass. 'Tis very inconveni-  
 ent, that a Man shou'd condemn all Mankind  
 to Death, and to all the other Miseries, and  
 Infirmities to which Humane Nature is now  
 obnoxious, for the eating of One single  
 Fruit; yet it is never the less true. 'Tis ve-  
 ry inconvenient, that ~~God~~ shou'd be con-  
 demn'd to *Eternal Flames* for One only Sin  
 wherein he dies unrepented; yet no Man e-  
 ver question'd this Truth. We must not then  
 conclude, from the Inconvenience that at-  
 tends a thing, that it is therefore false; but  
 we ought to weigh the Reasons, and Motives,  
 whereby we are induc'd to believe it is so:  
 Now the *Roman Catholicks* believe, that those  
 among the *Greeks* and *Eastern Churches*,  
 which are not in communion with the  
*Church of Rome*, together with the *Protestants*,  
 are no true *Members of the Catholick Church*;  
 because they have the most authentick Re-  
 cords, and the most invincible Proof that any

Matter of Fact, is capable of, that the said *Greeks*, Eastern Churches, and *Protestants* fell into Heresy and Schism, in which they do as yet actually persist. What Allowance God Almighty may make, for the invincible Ignorance and Want of Capacity in a great many of these People; and how far He will be Merciful and pardon the other Defects of those, who endeavour to live up to what they know, and want necessary Means to come to the Knowledge of the Truth, He alone knows. None, I am sure, is more willing to judge favourably of their *Salvation*, than *Roman Catholicks*: But to flatter them with Hopes of *Salvation*, whilst they persist in their Errours, and have necessary Means to come to the Knowledge of the Truth; and to tell them they may be saved with such Errours, when we are convinc'd in our Consciences they cannot, is surely no *Christian* Charity, but the greatest of Heathenish Cruelty.

5. " In consequence of the Truth, of this  
 " Proposition, and of the Importance of it  
 " to the *Salvation* of Souls; they ought to  
 " produce express Mention of the *Roman Catholick Church* in the ancient Creeds of the  
 " *Christian Churches*. But this, says the Dr.  
 " they are not able to do, on the contrary,  
 " *Aeneas Sylvius* (who was afterwards Pope  
 " *Pius the Second*) says, that before the Council of *Nice*, little Respect was had to the  
 " *Roman Church*.

*Ans.* Just so the *Arians* used to object to the *Catholicks*, that if the Word *Consubstantial* were



were of that Importance, as it was pretended, they ought to produce exprefs Mention of it, in the ancient Creed of the then present Church ; but as the *Catholicks* then answer'd, that it was enough, the thing meant by that Word was in the Creed, tho' not the Word is self ; so say we to the *Protestants*, that in these Words of the Creed, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*, is imply'd what we mean by the Words, *Roman Catholick Church* ; tho' the Word *Roman* be not there. What *Aeneas Sylvius* might, in Passion, or upon some private Quarrel with the *Pope*, have written, against the *Roman Church*, consider'd with respect only to the Diocess of *Rome*, I am not much concern'd : For I am sure he never said, nor writ, that the *Roman Church*, as it includes all the *Christian Churches* in communion with the *See of Rome* (in which Sense the *Dr.* could not be ignorant, we always take it) was not the true *Catholick Church*. Besides, if it be true, that *Aeneas Sylvius* said what the Doctor makes him here speak ; let the Holy and Learned Martyr *St. Irenaus*, who lived very near 200 Years before the *Council of Nice*, teach him the contrary. *Every Church*, says he, *that is the Faithful on every Side, must have recourse to this Church (the Roman) by reason of her more powerful Principality.* *Loco sup. cit.*

---

CHAP. IV.

Of Transubstantiation.

**W**Hat we hold to be of Faith concerning this Point, is this, That the whole

*whole Substance of the Bread and Wine is, after Consecration, chang'd into the Body and Blood of Christ; without any Alteration in the Accidents, or Outward Forms.*

This is to all our modern Sectaries, a *Stone of stumbling, and Rock of Offence*. Against this they have whetted their Pens and Tongues; and pointed all the Shafts of their Art, and Eloquence, in order to pull down an Edifice, *whose Builder and Maker is God Himself*.

But however they agree to destroy this mysterious Fabrick; yet what to substitute in its room, or how to expound those *Texts of Scripture* on which it is founded; none can with greater Heat and Passion, even to the most injurious and provoking Language, be divided; nor fall into more manifest Absurdities and Contradictions, than these Pretenders to Reformation.

And indeed, if the Disagreement of Witnesses be an Argument of their Falshood, as the Evangelists assure us it is; we have all the reason in the World to conclude, that these are False Witnesses: For, I am sure, none ever disagreed more, not only in the Circumstances, but even in the very Nature, and Substance of their Evidence.

*Martin Luther*, and his Adherents, expound these Words, *This is My Body*, literally, and therefore believe the *Real Presence of Christ's Body* in the Sacrament; but being however

Epist. ad  
Calv.

resolv'd to incommode the Pope, as *Luther* says, they add, that the Substance of the Bread, and Wine, is likewise there. And to extricate

cate

cate themselves from a Difficulty which attends the *Real Presence*, they affirm moreover, that the *Body of Christ* is every where. And thus they have brought forth Two New Points of Faith, never before heard of, namely *Consubstantiation*, and *Ubiquity*: And this the *Church of England Writers* call *An absurd and monstrous Doctrine*.

*Calvin*, and his Sectators, in contradiction to this, expound the same Words figuratively; and therefore believe a *Real Absence*, or which is all one, that the *Eucharist* is but a Type, or Figure of the *Body and Blood of Christ*. *Zuinglius* tells us, himself was the First, that found out this Exposition, by the Help of a certain Angel, which appear'd to him; but whether he was Black or White, he says, he cannot tell. So that, for ought he knew, it may be the Doctrine of a Devil; I am sure *Luther*, at least, did think it so; for he calls *Calvin* a Devil, and worse than a Devil, for offering to obtrude this Doctrine upon the World; and for wresting the plain Words of our *Saviour* to such a Sense. Epist. ad  
Calv.

The *Church of England* neither expounds those Words literally, nor yet figuratively; for she neither believes *Transubstantiation*, nor *Consubstantiation*; neither *Real Presence*, nor yet *Real Absence*. And to deal ingeniously, I do not well know what she believes in this Particular: And what is worse, to the best of my Understanding, nor she herself. For in the Catechism, which is put into the Children, and Common Peoples Hands (where surely the Articles of Faith must, if any



any where, be clearly and plainly expounded) she teaches, *That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*; which, I am sure, is the very same with the Doctrine of the *Council of Trent*; her verily and indeed being the self same thing with that Council's *verè & realiter*, Yet if you shou'd ask any of her Divines, whether the *Body and Blood of Christ* be, verily and indeed, in the Sacrament? They will answer you *No*: If you ask them further, *How can you then, verily and indeed, take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, if it be not there?* Some will answer you, that tho' His Body and Blood be not there; yet when you take the Bread and Wine, you take at the same time the *Body and Blood of Christ*, to all the Intents and Purposes of the Sacrament; but this is such a Riddle as passes my Skill to unfold. Others say, that by an Act of Faith you do verily and indeed, take and receive the *Body and Blood of Christ*, when you receive the Elements. But if you urge the Difficulty further, and tell them, that to receive the *Body and Blood of Christ* by Faith, is no more to receive it verily and indeed, than to receive an Idea, or Representation of a thing to which you give assent, is to receive the thing it self. Or suppose it were, you still admit of *Christ's Body* His being in several Places at once, which is the Inconvenience, you wou'd fain avoid, by rejecting the *Real Presence* in the Sacrament; for if one, in *London*, and another in *York*, shou'd

shou'd at the same time (which is very possible) *verily and indeed* take the *Body and Blood of Christ*; then surely the *Body of Christ* must needs be in Two different Places at once; if you urge, I say, the Difficulty thus far, you are like to get no Answer which either you, or any Body else can understand. So that tho' the *Church of England* has in other things, many signal Advantages of the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*; yet in this, she is neither so reasonable as they; nor so consistent with her self, nor yet with Common Sense.

Now to establish the *Roman Catholick's* Belief on this Subject, and to shew the Unreasonableness of the said Opinions (tho' of this Last there is little Need, their own Authors having in a great measure by their manifest Contradictions, and Absurdities, already done it to my Hand) I shall endeavour to prove as clear, and as brief, as I can.

1. *That the Words of Scripture on which Transubstantiation is grounded, are to be understood in a Literal Sense.*

2. *That such a Sense does necessarily infer Transubstantiation: And*

3. *That from the Beginning, all the Orthodox Christians in the World were of that Belief.*

I begin with the First.

The Words on which *Transubstantiation* is grounded, are these, *This is My Body which is given for you, Luke xxii. 19.* Now that these Words are to be taken in a Literal Sense, nothing can be more plain, both from *Christ's* Promise of giving His Body, as we read *St. John* Chap. vi. from *S. Paul's* Sense  
of

of these Words, in his *Epistle to the Corinthians*; and from the very Sense which the Words themselves must necessarily bear. From *Christ's* Promise.

*I am the Living Bread Which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: And the Bread That I will give, is My Flesh, Which I will give for the Life of the World, Jo. vi. 51.* *Christ* promises to give His Disciples a certain kind of Bread, which they were not as yet acquainted with: And to let them understand, what sort of Bread it was, He tells them, that it is His Flesh; *The Bread That I will give you is My Flesh.* This so unusual a thing, as eating Humane Flesh, cou'd not but startle them; however they cou'd not doubt, but He meant to do as He spoke, since He affirm'd, that the Bread He would give them was His Flesh: And therefore they strove amongst themselves, saying, *How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?* But how does *Christ* here disabuse them? Does he say His Words are not to be taken literally? Does He tell them they must understand Him in a Figurative Sense? No, He was so far from it, that with a repeated Oath He confirms them in the Sense they understood His Words: *Verily, verily, says He, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye shall have no Life in you.* When *Christ* said, *I am the Door; I am the True Vine, &c.* His Disciples were nothing offended at these Expressions, because they knew them to be Metaphors, and Figurative Sayings commonly



commonly us'd ; but here, you see, they are amaz'd and confounded. Had *Christ* only said, *I will give you Heavenly Bread*, or, *I will give you My Body* ; perhaps they might have taken this in a Figurative Sense too. But when He assures them, that the Bread He wou'd give them is His Flesh, and protests with a repeated Oath, that except they eat His Flesh, and drink His Blood, they shall have no Life in them ; he must surely renounce his Reason, who does not see, that he spoke and meant literally. In a word, if those Words be not understood in a Literal Sense, it is utterly impossible to know how any Phrase may be literally meant, the Words, *Is My Flesh*, being by *Christ* affirm'd of the Bread for no other End, and His confirming with an Oath that it was so, for no other Reason, than to persuade them that He meant as He spoke.

This is no less manifest from Saint *Paul's* Sense of the said Words. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ ? The Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ ?* 1 Cor. x. 16. Here the Apostle, agreeably to what *Christ* said, puts the Question, as if the *Corinthians* doubted it ; *Is not the Cup of Blessing which we bless, the Communion of the Blood of Christ ? &c.* Now what is it to communicate, or partake of the *Body and Blood of Christ* ? Surely it is to eat and drink of His Body and Blood, as, to communicate, or partake of Bread and Wine, is to eat of the Bread and drink of the Wine.

Again,

Again, *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth, and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.* Chap. xi. 27, 28, 29. This surely, is too severe a Sentence, if *S. Paul* understood *Christ's* Words in a Figurative Sense. If that Bread, and that Cup be only a Type and Figure of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, whosoever abuses, or takes them unworthily, ought, in Reason, to be somewhat less guilty, than if he had, in reality, abus'd His Body and Blood. But the Apostle declares, that such a one shou'd be guilty of no less than the *Body and Blood of Christ*, which, surely, is to be guilty of the greatest Crime that can be imagin'd.

When a Man murders, or spills the Blood of another, he is but guilty of his Blood: This is the common Language of Mankind, and no Man, in his Wits, did ever so much as imagine, that a Man, who shou'd abuse the Figure or Picture of another, shou'd be therefore guilty of his Body or Blood: Seeing then *St. Paul* affirms, that those, who abuse, or take unworthily that Sacred Bread and Cup, are guilty of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, it is a perfect Demonstration, that he did not believe them to be a Type or Figure, but His Real Flesh and Blood.

The *Jews* crucified *Christ*, spilt His Blood, and abus'd His Body; yet the *Scripture* says

where, that they were in that Particular, guilty of more, than of the Blood of *Christ*. and of more I cannot tell how they cou'd. For neither Humane, nor Angelical Wit can invent a heavier Charge. With what Propriety of Speech then? Nay, with what Reason can it be affirm'd, that Men shou'd be guilty of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, as were the *Jews*, for doing no more, than taking unworthily the Type or Figure of His Body and Blood? In a word, no Man can be guilty of the Blood of another, unless he spills his Blood, or takes away his Life; but *S. Paul* here affirms, that, *Whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and shall besides, eat and drink Damnation to himself*; consequently he believ'd, and was persuaded, that this Sacred Bread and Cup were the True and Real *Flesh and Blood of Christ*. And this is so plain from his last Words, that I wonder any Man in his Senses can entertain the least Doubt concerning it: For he concludes, that the Reason, why they do eat, and drink *Damnation* to themselves, is, because they do not discern, that that Spiritual Food, which they abuse is the *Lord's Body*; *Non dijudicans Corpus Domini*.

This is yet more plain from the Sense, which the Words of the Institution must necessarily bear. *Τὸ ἰσχυρὸν σώμα μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*. *This is My Body, Which is given for you*, *Luke xxii. 19*. The Evangelist tells us, a little before these Words, that *Christ took Bread, and*  
I gave



*gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to His Disciples*; and to let them understand what sort of Bread it was, or rather, what He intended to make it, He says, that it is His Body; and to take away all Occasion of Doubt, whether He had meant His True and Real Body, or else the Figure of it: He adds, *Which is given for you*; so that they, who believ'd the Omnipotent Power of *Christ*, cou'd no more doubt, but that that, which He tender'd them, was the Body, Which was to be given for them. Now, if that Body, Which was given for them, be the True and Real Body of *Jesus Christ*, we are sure, that the Body Which *Christ* gave His Disciples, was His True and Real Body: For He says, it is that Body Which is given for us; *This is My Body Which is given for you*. But all the World, as well *Protestants*, as *Catholicks*, agree, that It was the True and Real Body of *Christ*, Which was given, and suffer'd upon the Cross for us. It is then a Demonstration, that what *Christ* tender'd to His Apostles was His True and Real Body, consequently His Words must necessarily be taken in a Literal Sense.

Had *Christ* only said; to what He held in His Hand, *This is My Body*; perhaps such a Proposition, to one, who never heard any thing of the Matter before, might seem Figurative; but when He adds these other Words, *Which is given for you*, He takes away all Occasion of Doubt, and determines the Understanding to a Literal Sense. The First Part of the Phrase, *This is My Body*, is indifferent

indifferent of it self, and may be capable of either Sense; but add the rest to it. *Which is given for you,* and the Sense is plainly determin'd. So that *Christ's* Words can no more allow of a Figurative Sense, than, if a Man had said, *This is my Arm, which sticks to my Shoulder,* he can be understood to mean any thing else but his true and real Arm. In a word, these Gentlemen, who are resolv'd to deny things so evident, wou'd, in my Opinion, be less obnoxious to Censure, and more excusable in Humane Appearance, if they had either question'd the Truth of these Texts, or, like the *Socinians*, deny'd the Omnipotence of *Jesus Christ* to effect this Miracle, than thus to subvert the very Foundation of Humane Reason.

2. *Christ's* Words understood in a Literal Sense, must necessarily imply *Transubstantiation*, that is, *A Change of one Substance into another*: For *Christ* having said of the Bread, *This is My Body Which is given for you*: And it being visible to our Senses, that there is no Alteration, or Change, in the Accidents, or Outward Forms, it is impossible to understand those Words in a Literal Sense, but we must at the same time necessarily conclude, that there must be a Change in the Substance. For the Bread consisting of Substance, and Accidents only, we cannot believe the Veracity of *Jesus Christ*, when He affirms of the Bread, that It is His Body, nor His Omnipotent Power to effect by His Word, what He says, unless we likewise believe, that the Bread is chang'd into the *Body of Christ*;

*Christ*; but it is evident to our Senses, that there is no Change, as to the Accidents: Consequently the Change must be in the Substance. Besides, it is impossible to verifie those Words of *Christ* in a Literal Sense, without a Substantial Change: For the *Greek Demonstrative τὸ*, the *Latin Hoc*, or the *English, This*, cannot with any Propriety of Speech, be referr'd to the Accidents of the thing whereof it is affirm'd; but must necessarily be referr'd to the thing it self, which, surely, is the Substance, and not the Accidents: So that the Sense of these Words, *This is My Body*, must necessarily be, *This Substance, cloathed with these Accidents, is My Body*; and then, if we believe those Words, we must consequently believe, that that Substance is His Body, and then this necessarily implies *Transubstantiation*.

Hence it is evident, that those Words cannot with any Colour of Reason be understood in a Sense of *Consubstantiation*, as the *Lutherans* wou'd have it: For the *Demonstrative Hoc, This*, as aforefaid, denoting the Substance affirm'd by *Christ* to be His Body, Common Sense shews, it wou'd be absurd to interpret these Words, *This is My Body*, so as to mean, that *Christ's Body* is there together with the Substance of the Bread, as the *Lutherans* grossly maintain; whereas, if *Christ* had so meant, He wou'd most certainly have said, *Here is My Body*, and not, *This is My Body*. But this is so publicly exploded by all the rest of the *Protestants*, that it needs no further Confutation.



3. All the Orthodox *Christians*, from the Beginning, understood those Words of *Christ*, both in a Literal Sense, and in a Sense of *Transubstantiation*.

I shou'd fill up a Volume, were I to bring all the Passages of Councils, and Fathers, which make for this Truth; no Mystery of our Religion being ever with more Care inculcated, and expounded by the Fathers in their Homilies, Catechisms, and familiar Discourses to the Common People; and that, no Doubt, for the Difficulty Men naturally have to believe it. But it not being my Design to write all that may be said for it, but what may suffice to evince the Truth of it; I shall content my self with the Testimony of a few Councils, and Fathers, whose Authority and Weight, however, I hope, shall make sufficient amends for the Smalness of their Number. And,

1. *That the Orthodox Christians, from the Beginning, understood Christ's Words in a Literal Sense, or, which is the same thing, believ'd the Real Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament*, let S. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, bear witness. This Great Patriarch in his Epistle to *Nestorius*, speaks thus of the *Eucharist*; *Neque enim Illam, ut Carnem Communem, suscipimus, absit hoc, neque rursum tanquam Viri cujuspiam Sanctificati, & Dignitatis Unitate Verbo Consociati; sed tanquam vere Vivificam ipsius Verbi propriam*, God forbid we shou'd receive It as Common Flesh, nor yet as the Flesh of a Man Sanctified, and United to the Word, by a Conjunction of Dignity; but we receive It,

*as It truly is, the Quickning and Proper Flesh of the Word Himself.*

This Letter was read, and approv'd in the Third General Council, \* which, no Doubt, would never have been, had it contain'd any thing contrary to Orthodox Faith; so that having receiv'd Authority, and Approbation from those Fathers, we shall no more consider it, as the Doctrine of a Private Man, but as the Faith of the whole General Council. Now can it be imagin'd, that this Council, which represented the whole *Catholick Church*, shou'd approve, and put upon Record a Letter, which declares the *Real Presence*, as clear, and plain, as is possible for Words to express it, unless it had been, at that time, the Faith of the whole *Catholick Church*? And can it be imagin'd, that the *Catholick Church*, in those *fair Days of her Youth*, as the *Calvinists* speak, shou'd believe, that *Christ's Proper Flesh*, as the said Letter words it, was in the Sacrament, unless they had understood *Christ's* Words in a Literal Sense, and receiv'd the same Doctrine from their immediate Ancestours? Or can it be imagin'd, that these Ancestours shou'd be of this Belief, unless they had likewise receiv'd it from their Ancestours, and so up to the very Apostles? This is, surely, to any Man of Sense, but more especially ought to be to the *Church of England* (who professes to receive the Acts and Decrees of this Council) instead of a Demonstration, that from the Beginning of *Christianity* to the Time of this Council, all the

\* *Concil.*  
*Ephes.*  
*Sancto vii*

the Orthodox *Christians* did both believe the *Real Presence*, and understand *Christ's Words* in a *Literal Sense*.

2. *That the Orthodox Christians, from the Beginning, understood those Words of Christ (This is My Body) in a Sense of Transubstantiation, we have the unanimous Consent of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, many whereof, in their familiar Discourses to the Common People, illustrate this Conversion, by the Change of the Water, into Wine; of Aaron's Rod, into a Serpent; of the River Nilus, into Blood; and the like. And 'tis very observable, that in all their Discourses upon this Subject, and whenever they speak of this Change, they have recourse to the Omnipotent Power of God, to Which alone they ascribe it, which surely wou'd be very needless, had there been no real Change in the Case. S. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem, speaks thus, concerning this Change. Therefore, since Christ hath said of the Bread, This is My Body, who durst any more doubt it? And since He Himself so positively affirm'd, saying, This is My Blood, who ever doubted, so as to say, that It was not His Blood? In time past, at the Wedding of Canan in Galilee, He chang'd Water into Wine, which has a certain Likeness to Blood; and shall not we think Him Worthy to be believ'd, that He cou'd change Wine into His Blood? Again, For under the Appearance of Bread, He gives us His Body, and under the Appearance of Wine, He gives us His Blood. And a little after, Though your Senses seem in this, to oppose you, yet Faith*



## Transubstantiation.

*must confirm you; do not judge the thing by the Taste, but let Faith assure you, beyond all Doubt, that you partake of the Body and Blood of Christ. Cate. Mystag 3.*

Here is a Great Bishop, an Eminent Witness of Antiquity, One, who flourish'd 1300 Years since, and who, no Doubt, knew very well the *Faith of the Catholick Church* of his Time touching this Point: Here is a careful Pastor expounding *Christ's Words*, and catechising his Flock in the very Language of the present *Roman Catholicks*. He tells them that, since *Christ* said, that the Bread and Wine were His Body and Blood, they must believe that the Bread and Wine were chang'd into His Body and Blood. He illustrates this Change by a familiar Comparison of the Water, which *Christ* chang'd into Wine, and inforces the Belief of the Possibility of the other, by the actual Existence of this Change which they both read, and believ'd. He tells them, that under the Appearance of Bread they receive the *Body*, and under the Appearance of Wine, they receive the *Blood of Christ*; and that though their Senses may tell them, that It is still Bread, yet their Faith must correct that Mistake; that they must not judge what It is by the Taste, but must believe, that It is the *Body and Blood of Christ*, whatever their Senses may suggest to them to the contrary.

Did ever any *Roman Catholick* speak plainer concerning *Transubstantiation*? Can any *Roman Bishop*, or *Pastor* at present, inforce the Belief of this Mystery with more cogent Arguments,

Arguments, than to tell his Auditors, that since *Christ* said, *This is My Body*, we must believe It is so ; since He chang'd Water into Wine, we have no reason to doubt, but His Omnipotence is sufficient to change Wine into His Blood ; that tho' it appears to our Eyes, to our Taste, to our Smell, that the thing is otherwise, yet we must not, in this Business, rely upon the Relation of these Senses, but upon the Sense of Hearing ; because *Faith is by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God*, Which Word we are here only requir'd to believe ? All which are the very Reasonings of *S. Cyril*. Now what the *Protestants* may think of this Great Man, I shall not determine ; but this I am sure of, that had he written this since the *Reformation*, they wou'd have all reckon'd him to be as rank a *Papist*, as ever put Pen to Paper.

*S. Gregory Nissen*, speaks thus to the same Purpose ; *Recte Dei Verbo Sanctificatum Panem, in Dei Verbi Corpus credo transmutari. I do believe, that the Bread Sanctified by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God the Word, Orat. Cate. Cap. xxxvii.*

*S. Ambrose* takes a great deal of pains to inculcate this Truth to the ignorant People, instancing in several real Changes, as that of *Aaron's Rod* into a Serpent ; of the Creation of the World out of nothing, &c. I will instance in One only of his Passages to this Purpose. 'Tis indeed somewhat tedious to be brought here at length, however, since it cannot be well understood, unless it be intirely read, I hope the Reader will pardon

don me so necessary a Fault. *Paniste* (says he) *ante Verba Sacramentorum Panis est, &c.* That Bread, before the Sacramental Words, is Bread; but when the Consecration comes to it, of the Bread is made the Flesh of Christ. Let us prove this. How can that, which is Bread be the Body of Christ? By Consecration. By what, and by whose Words is the Consecration perform'd? By the Words of the Lord Jesus. For all other

\* Note. things, which are said do give praise to God, there is a Prayer premis'd for the People, for Kings, and for others; but when the Priest comes to make the Venerable Sacrament, he does no more use his own but Christ's Words. Therefore the Word of Christ maketh this Sacrament. What Word of Christ? Even that Word, by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the Earth was made; The Lord commanded, and every Creature was ingender'd. You see then how Efficacious the Word of Christ is. Seeing then, there is so much Efficacy in the Word of the Lord Jesus, as cause things that were not, to have a Being. How much more Efficacious is it, to make the things that are extant, to be changed into another thing? Heaven was not, the Sea was not, the Earth was not; but hear him that says: He said, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created. That I may answer you then. It was not the Body of Christ before Consecration, but after Consecration, I say unto you, that it is then the Body of Christ; He said, and it was made, He commanded, and it was created, *Lib. iv. de Sacra. Cap. iv. \**

I Saint Ambrose his Works, or some other Bishops near his Time, who dilates upon what St. Ambrose wrote concerning the Eucharist.



I shall not trouble the Reader with any Reflections upon this Passage, being, in my Opinion, so plain, and so much to the Purpose, that it cannot possibly need any thing to strengthen it. Nor will I tire his Patience with any more, from Fathers, it being evident to any Man of Sense, that these Great Pillars of the Church, Men so eminent, both for Learning and Piety, wou'd never have believ'd *Transubstantiation*, nor have taken so much pains to inculcate it to the People, had it not been the universal Belief of the *Catholick Church*. I shall only add some Words

of the Decree of the *Council of Lateran* on this Subject, and so conclude. The Words which relate to our Purpose are these. *Transubstantiatis Pane & Vino in Corpus & Sanguinem Christi. The Bread and Wine being transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ.* *Concil. Later. iv. sub Inno. III.*

This, all the *Protestants* confess, is very plain, in favour of *Transubstantiation*, and therefore they do most outrageously declaim against it, and even force their Lungs and Pipes, both to decry the Decree, and to expose the Authors of it. For my part, I am in no Passion, nor Heat; I shall therefore soberly, and calmly examine what this Council was; what Authority it may justly claim, and how far it ought to influence our Faith. If it be found, to be only a Conventicle of Hereticks, or a confus'd Assembly of some Bishops met together without any Authority from the *Chief Pastor*, and other Patriarchs of the Church, in order to broach New Doctrines in opposition to the Faith, which was

once

## Transubstantiation.

*once deliver'd unto the Saints* ; then it will be but reasonable, we reject their Authority : But if, on the contrary, it appears to have been an Oecumenical or General Council, representing the whole *Catholick Church* ; and that all the individual *Members of the Catholick Church*, at that time receiv'd, and acquiesc'd to its Decrees, especially to that Part of it, which relates to our present Purpose, it is but just and reasonable, we pay the same Respect, and Deference to it.

Now, after having examin'd the Authentick Acts of this Council, and consulted all the (at least) Famous Historians, and Ecclesiastical Writers of those Times, and even the Writings of some of our Learned Adversaries, I find, that it has all the Marks, and Characters, which even the most Oecumenical Council ever yet had. I find, that this Council was call'd by common Consent of both Emperours, and of all the Kings, and free State in *Europe* ; that it was held in *Rome*, in the Year of our Lord 1215. *Pope Innocent III* presiding in it. The best Historians of those Times, tells us, that there were near 1200 Prelates in this Council ; that the *Patriarchs of Constantinople*, and *Jerusalem*, were there in Person ; that the *Patriarchs of Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, being under the Yoke of the *Saracen* and *Turkish Tyranny*, because they cou'd not come in Person, sent their Deputies instructed with Power to represent their Persons and Churches. As to *Europe*, the great Number of Prelates there assembled shew, even to a Demonstration, that

that there were more than sufficient Representatives of the Western Churches. And what more can be desir'd to compleat a General Council?

Now can any Man imagine, that so August an Assembly as this, so many Grave and Learn'd Men of different Humours, Interests, and Manners, shou'd all conspire together to impose upon themselves and all Mankind besides, a New Doctrine, in one of the most essential Points of *Christian Faith*, contrary to what they had receiv'd from their Ancestours, and that not One Honest Man shou'd be found among them all to discover the Imposture? Or that all Mankind shou'd acquiesce to such a Doctrine, and none say, *This is contrary to what we have been hitherto taught?* Can it be imagin'd, that the Bishops who met here on purpose to hear every individual Prelate tell his own Story, and to declare what Faith he had receiv'd from his Ancestours on this Subject, who aim'd at nothing else, but to find out the Truth; but to see wherein they did all agree; and to reckon that only as an Article of their Faith, which shou'd be found to be the same in every Man's Mouth; any yet, that contrary to the main End and Design of their Meeting, and, what is more to the *Eternal Damnation* of their own Souls, they shou'd unanimously agree to declare as an Article of their Faith, what they neither receiv'd, nor knew, nor believ'd before? In a word, is it possible, that any Man of Sense cou'd imagine, that in any  
Age



Age of the Church, the *Pope*, Patriarchs, Bishops, Kings, Princes, and People shou'd all agree to receive, as an Article of Faith, that which the Apostles never deliver'd to their Ancestours, nor their Ancestours to them? And if this be absurd, and not to be suppos'd, as most certainly it is, with what Colour of Reason can any Man refuse the Evidence of this Council? What shall we believe, if we do not believe so Great, and so Grave an Assembly? Here are, from all Parts of the *Christian World*, so many Hundreds of Learned Prelates, attesting on no less Penalty than their *Eternal Damnation*, if false, that this is the Faith, which the Apostles deliver'd to the Church; that this is the Doctrine, which they receiv'd from their Forefathers. Here are all the rest of the Prelates, and People of the whole *Catholick Church*, likewise declaring, by their ready Acceptance, and Submission to this Doctrine, that it is the same they receiv'd from their Predecessours. And now, if after all this, Men will be so much in love with their Fancies as to believe, that the whole *Catholick Church*, both in its Representatives, and in the *Diffusive Body of Christians*, cou'd be induc'd to conspire together to deceive their Posterity, against their own plain and true Interest; against the Trust and Confidence repos'd in them; the Duty, and Piety of Parents to their Children; the tender Care they ought to have for their Welfare; and contrary to the Main End and Design of the Divine Goodness, Who put His Word into their

their Mouths, to the end they might faithfully deliver it to succeeding Generations; and all this, notwithstanding the Terrours of the Lord, and the Wrath of God reveal'd from *Heaven*, against all impious Liers; notwithstanding the dreadful Woes and Curses pronounc'd in *Scripture* against false Seducers, and the horrible Aggravation of their own Guilt, for having led so many Millions into Errour and Perdition. Add to this the Promise of the *Holy Ghost's* guiding the Church into all Truth, the Assistance of the *Divine Spirit* with it to the End, and Consummation of the World; the Dear and Tender Love of the Great Shepherd of our Souls for His Flock; and the great Care and Concern, He has for the Preservation of His Church, for which He shed His most Precious Blood: If after all this, I say, Men will be so far deluded, as to believe such Dreams, I shall only say to them, as *Joshua* did to the *Children of Israel*; *If it seem evil to you to serve the Lord, chuse you this Day whom you will serve— But for me and my House, we will serve the Lord*, and believe His Holy Word. Joh. xxiv

Thus much concerning the Proof of this Mystery: Let us now see what the Dr. objects.

Never *Roman Conquerour* sung more *Pæans* after Victory, nor insulted over his Enemy with more Ostentation, than Dr. *Tillotson* has, on this Subject, over the *Roman Catholicks*, and the *Church of Rome*; and (to compleat the Parallel) if his Railing Eloquence and *Unchristian Contumelies* (I am sorry he extorts such Words from me) were of equal Force

to

to blind, with that of *Roman* Chains, no barbarous Captives were ever worse us'd, by their insulting Conquerors, than the Sons of that Mother, whose Piety, and Zeal brought forth, in *Christ*, his Ancestours, have the fortune to be treated by the *Unchristian* Slanders, and Calumnies of his bitter Tongue and Pen. Besides, that invincible Argument (if we believe him) that *Achilles*, *The Evidence of Sense*, which he pretends to be against this Mystery, and which he repeats over and over, in more Places of his Sermons, than I can at present reckon, he has oblig'd us with a Treatise written on purpose upon this Subject, which he calls *A Discourse against Transubstantiation*. It begins Vol. iii. Pag. 297.

In this Piece, I meet with as copious a Collection of scurrilous, injurious Language; of notorious and manifest Impositions; and so much Disingenuity in citing of Authors, and managing their Authorities, as I believe, was ever possible for any Man, who had never so little Esteem for his Credit, to bring within so narrow a Compass.

Now to answer all this Discourse, and to lay open all this Disingenuity; to set these Passages of the Fathers, which he mangles, and dismembers in their due Light; and to shew the Scope and End, at which those Fathers aim'd, wou'd alone require a Volume of no small Bulk, which in no wise agrees with my design'd Brevity, nor yet with my present Affairs. I shall therefore be content at present, to answer his main Objection ta-

ken



ken from the Evidence of Sense, which is the only Objection I find in all his Sermons; but with as many Faces as *Proteus*, was said to have; and some Three, or Four more, taken out of this Discourse, which are the only real Difficulties in it; being resolv'd however to lay hold on the next Opportunity to answer the whole, Paragraph by Paragraph.

His main Objection is this: Transubstantiation is contradicted by Sense: The Evidence of our Senses is against it: 'Tis contrary to the common Sense and Reason of Mankind, &c.

Vol. iii.  
Pag. 80,  
81. Vol. v.  
Page 3.

*Ans.* This he repeats over and over; and to inforce the Belief of it, he tell us in several Places, that it destroys the external Means of confirming the Truth of Christianity. But he only repeats it; for I could never yet find in all his Books, that he has made the least Offer to prove it. He wou'd have us, it seems, be so civil as to take it for granted: For without this, I believe, nay, I am sure, he did not well know how to go about to prove it. And 'tis a thing I often admir'd, with how much Confidence this Good Man and others, wou'd press this Argument upon us, without ever offering the least Proof for it, when at the same time, they knew very well we firmly deny it. And this seems so much the more strange; because the more evident any thing is, as they pretend this to be, the easier it is to find Mediums to prove it. But neither he, nor all the Philosophers that ever were, or are to come, shall ever be able to make one good Argument to prove that Transubstantiation is

Ec. Vol. vi.  
Pag. 165.

K contradicted

contradicted by Sense. For what is *Transubstantiation*? *The Change of one Substance into another.* Of what Sense then is Substance, the Object, that such a Change may be discover'd by it? 'Tis of no Sense sure, but of the Understanding, as all the World knows. How can that then contradict Sense, which is not the Object of any Sense; since no Faculty can be employ'd, but about its proper Object? They might as well tell us that Colours contradict the Sense of Hearing, or Sound the Sense of seeing. Had we said, that there is a Trans-Accidentation in that Mystery, the Dr. wou'd then, indeed, have been in the right to press his Argument; Accidents being the proper Objects of our Senses; but surely, we never said any such thing, consequently we never contradicted our Senses upon that Subject. We see with our Eyes, that the Accidents remain the same as before, we therefore conclude, that the Change must be in the Substance, which we cannot see; because *Christ* told us it was His Body, and because we are sure, He was able by His Omnipotent Power, to make it His Body.

But, says the Dr. *There are all the Accidents of the Bread; and wherever the proper Accidents of any Substance is, there the Substance must necessarily be.*

*Ans.* 1. Suppose this were true, there is still no contradicting of Senses in the Case; since we own the Accidents are there, which alone are the Object of our Senses.

2. Will the Dr. himself say, that this is and always was, necessarily true? No, for

he tells us, Vol. ii. Pag. 67. That God may impose upon our Senses, and if He tells us the thing is otherwise than it appears, we must believe him. All that this Argument proves then is, that ordinarily, and for the most part, the Matter is so; but why may not God, notwithstanding this, do otherwise upon extraordinary Occasions, especially in Mysteries of Faith, which are not subject to the ordinary Rules of Nature? And why may not we believe, that the Accidents of Bread may exhibit another Substance to us, especially since we have the Word of the *Son of God* for it, as well as the Accidents of a Dove, and the Appearance of Men cou'd represent the *Holy Ghost*, and the Angels to *S. John the Baptist*, and to *Lot. John the Baptist* saw, in appearance, a Dove descend and remain upon *Christ*; yet he believ'd it was not a real Dove, because he was told by Him That sent him (*God*) that It was the *Holy Ghost*, That was to descend, and remain upon Him. And why may not we likewise believe the same God, when He tells us, that That Which appears to us to be Bread, is His Body? *John the Baptist*, says, *I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven Like a Dove, and it abode upon Him, and I knew Him not. But He that sent me to baptise with Water, the same said unto me, upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He that baptiseth with the Holy Ghost, John i. 31, 32.* Now *John the Baptist* might have waited till now, and expected to see the *Holy Ghost* descend upon *Christ*,



and yet be never the wiser, had he been of the Doctor's Opinion: For, if he must, in that respect, believe his Senses, he is never like to see the *Holy Ghost*, Who, surely, has neither Colour, Shape, nor Figure to affect our Senses. And whatever Shape, or Figure the *Holy Ghost* appear'd in *S. John* was still in right of maintaining his Ground, and of affirming (if we believe the Dr.) that What he saw was not the *Holy Ghost*, but a Dove, or something else: For he might have said with the Dr. *The Evidence of Sense is infallible: Whatever my Eyes represent to me I must believe it: Take away the Evidence of Sense, and you destroy all Knowledge: What appears to my Eyes, is a Dove; therefore I cannot, nor must not believe it is the Holy Ghost, or any thing else but a Dove. When you told me I shou'd see the Holy Ghost descending, &c. I gave credit to my Hearing, by which I perceiv'd your Words; and now, I must contradict my Sight, which tells me, this is a Dove. Or, if I believe It is the Holy Ghost, why may not I as well question my Hearing, and doubt whether you said any such thing to me, as I must now disclaim the Evidence of my Sight, which surely, is a Sense every whit as infallible, as my Hearing?* May not all these Questions, and Reasonings, be urg'd by *S. John*, as well as by the Doctor? But alas! *S. John* never dreamt of any such thing: For he knew very well, and so might the Dr. too, if he cou'd divest himself of his Prejudices, that tho' we must ordinarily rely upon the Evidence of our Senses, yet when God tells us the thing is otherwise than our Senses

Senses represent it, we ought to give credit to His Word, because we are sure, on the one side, His Word cannot be False, and we know, on the other, He may impose upon our Senses. And sure, this does not destroy any Humane Knowledge, or Science; since it does not hinder but that, in all other things, we may rely, and that most assuredly, upon the Evidence of our Senses, only where the Word, and Omnipotent Power of God is pleas'd to interpose. Nor does it, in the least, shake the external Means of confirming the Truth of *Christianity*, as the Dr. wou'd bear the World in hand it does. For, when our *Saviour* bad the Apostles have recourse to their Senses, to convince them of the Truth of His Resurrection, He did not tell them, that they must not believe their Senses in that Particular. Since we are then, in all things, which are not repugnant to God's Word, not only allow'd to follow the Evidence of our Senses (for that we always uncontrollably do) but also may safely believe, that the Substance, which such Accidents, or Objects of our Senses usually represent, is infallibly there, how can that Doctrine, which is warranted by the same Divine Word, in that, wherein it seems to be repugnant to Sense destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of *Christianity*; it being evident, that wherever *Christ* appeal'd to the Evidence of Sense, for the Proof of any of His Miracles, He never disclaim'd that Evidence, nor said, nor acted any thing, that might seem to invalidate it.

## Transubstantiation.

But, surely, this cannot be said of the *Eucharist*, nor of St. *John's* Dove, nor yet of *Lor's* Young Men: For it is said of the First, That It is the *Body of Christ*, tho' It has the Appearance of Bread; of the Second, That it was the *Holy Ghost*, tho' under the Appearance of a Dove; and of the Third, That they were Angels, tho' under the Appearance of Men. Now, how can the Belief of *Transubstantiation* destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of *Christianity*, any more than the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*, under the Form of a Dove, or of the Angels, under the Form of Men? Here is a Dove and Two Men in Appearance, and as far as Corporeal Senses can discover; yet they are believ'd to be the *Holy Ghost*, and Two Angels. There is Bread, in appearance, yet it is believ'd to be the *Body of Christ*. Is not the Evidence of our Senses equally disclaim'd in both? Do not we believe contrary to what we see in the one, as well as in the other? Notwithstanding, no Man ever yet affirm'd, that the Belief of the *Holy Ghost*, under the Form of a Dove, or of the Angels, under the Form of Men, did destroy the external Means of confirming the Truth of *Christianity*. How can the Belief of *Transubstantiation* destroy 'em then?

Thus you see how grossly the Common People are abus'd, on the one hand, when they are made to believe, that *Transubstantiation* is so monstrously absurd, as the Dr. wou'd fain here paint it: And how hardy he himself must needs have been, on the other, when



when he had the Courage to deliver out of the very Pulpit, *The Chair of Truth*, that it was, as evidently contrary to the common Sense of Mankind, as it is evident that *twice Two make Four*. Vol. v. Pag. 18, 19. But I have another Challenge to him yet: He tells us in the foregoing Page, That *in things doubtful, a modest Man would be very apt to be stagger'd by the Judgment of a very wise Man; and much more, of many such, and especially by the unanimous Judgment of the Generality of Men, the general Voice and Opinion of Mankind, being next to the Voice of God Himself*. And, a little after, he gives this Reason for it; *Because in things Lawful and Indifferent, we are bound by the Rules of Decency, and Civility, not to thwart the General Practice, and by the Commands of God, we are certainly oblig'd to obey the Lawful Commands of Lawful Authority*. Since then the Falshood of *Transubstantiation* is not only doubtful, but the Truth of it is establish'd upon the firmest Foundation, either in *Heaven*, or on *Earth*, even upon that Word, which shall never pass away, tho' *Heaven and Earth* shall; and since the Belief of it, when the *Reformation* began, was grounded upon the General Voice and Opinion of the Generality of Mankind, as the Dr. and all those of his Persuasion do acknowledge; and upon the Lawful Commands of Lawful Authority, if any such thing were on *Earth*; I appeal to his own Judgment, if every Man be not bound, both in Decency, and Civility, and by the Commands of God, not to thwart, or contradict a Point of Faith so firmly establish'd. K 4 And

And now, if after this, any Man will undertake to justify the Doctor's Conduct, and vindicate what he writ against *Transubstantiation*, I here make him this fair Offer, for his Encouragement; That tho' this good Dr. is

Vol. III. pleas'd to say, That in the *Business* of Tran-  
 Pag. 299. substantiation, it is not a Controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of down-right Impudence (civilly spoken) against the plain Meaning of Scripture, and the Sense, and Reason of Mankind: If he, I say, or any Body else will bring but One Single Argument in Mood, and Figure, to prove that *Transubstantiation* does either contradict Sense or Reason, I do sincerely promise him, I will be of his Opinion the very next Moment. And this I do the more confidently affirm, because I am sure, *Transubstantiation* cannot possibly contradict, or be against Sense or Reason. Sense it cannot; for it is not the Object of any of our Senses; and, surely, it is not against Reason, that one Substance shou'd be chang'd into another; since all Generations, and Corruptions are thus perform'd; and even daily Experience teaches us, that the Meat, on which we feed, does not nourish us, but in as much, as it is chang'd into the Substance of our Flesh. And to let the World know, it is not the *Roman Catholicks* alone, who see the Absurdity of this Pretence, I will transcribe the Words of an ingenious *Socinian* upon this Subject, who, surely, is no more a Friend to the *Roman Catholicks* than to the *Protestants*. They are taken out of a Book intitled,

*Considerations*

*Considerations on the Explication of the Trinity, &c. Pag. 21. He cites the Words of the Bishop of Sarum taken out of his Discourse concerning the Divinity, and Death of Christ, Pag. 94. which are these: Transubstantiation must not be a Mystery, because there is against it, the Evidence of Sense, in an Object of Sense: For Sense plainly represents to us the Bread and Wine, to be still the same, that they were before the Consecration.*

And thus he speaks his own Thoughts of them.

*This is (says he) every way faulty; for it is not pretended by the Papists, that the Bread and Wine have received any the least Change, in what is an Object of Sense. The Papists following the Philosophy of Aristotle, distinguish in Bodies these Two things; The Accidents (such as the Quantity, Figure, Colour, Smell, Taste, and such like) which are Objects of our Senses: And the Substance which bears, and is cloathed (as it were) with these visible, and sensible Accidents; but is it self invisible, and the Object of our Understanding, not of our Senses. They say hereupon, our Saviour having call'd the Sacrament, His Body and Blood, because our Senses assure us, there is no Change of the (sensible) Accidents; therefore the Change, that is made, must be in the (invisible) Substance: Which Change they therefore call Transubstantiation. Nor do they say, that Christ is corporally (or bodily) present in the Sacrament, but that His Body is present, in a Spiritual Manner: As Cardinal Bellarmin largely discourses. De Eucharist. L. 1. C. 2.*

*His*



*His Lordship therefore is greatly out, in pretending that the Transubstantiation, as held by the Papists, is contradicted by Sense, in an Object of Sense. Thus far this ingenious Man. Whence 'tis evident how miserably weak the Doctor's Pretence to Evidence of Sense against this Mystery is; and how grossly he abuses Mankind, when alluding to Transubstantiation, he tells them, they do not come to learn from their Guides, or Pastors the Difference between Sea and Dry Land, or between North and South; as if they had the same Evidence, that there is no Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, as they have of the Difference of Sea from Dry Land, or of North from South.*

2. The Four Objections taken out of the Doctor's Discourse against Transubstantiation, are these.

*Vol. III. 1. Tertullian speaks thus of the Eucharist: Pag. 315. The Bread, which our Saviour took, and distributed to His Disciples, He made His Own Body. Saying; This is My Body, that is, The Figure of My Body; but it cou'd not have been the Figure of His Body, if there had not been a true, and real Body. Advers. Marcion. L. iv. Here Tertullian seems to insinuate, that the Eucharist is the Figure of Christ's Body.*

*Vol. III. 2. S. Austin seems to be of the same Opinion: Pag. 318. Our Lord, says he, did not doubt to say, This is My Body, when He gave the Sign of His Body. Lib. contra Adimant.*

*Vol. III. 3. Theodoret speaks to the same purpose, in Pag. 324. his 2d Dialogue between a Catholick, under the Name of Orthodoxus, and an Heretick under the Name of Eranistes; where he makes Eranistes*

*Eraniſtes* ſpeak theſe Words; *As the Symbols of the Lord's Body, and Blood, are one thing before the Invocation of the Prieſt, but after the Invocation are chang'd, and become another thing; ſo the Body of our Lord after His Aſcenſion, is chang'd into the Divine Subſtance.* To which the *Catholick Orthodoxus* answers thus; *Thou art caught in thy own Net; becauſe the Myſtical Symbols after Conſecration, do not paſs out of their own Nature; for they remain in their former Subſtance, Figure and Appearance; and may be ſeen, and handled as before.*

4. Pope *Gelaſius* ſeems to be of the ſame Pag. 325. Mind: Surely, ſays he, *The Sacraments, which we receive of the Body, and Blood of our Lord are a Divine thing; ſo that by them we are made Partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the Subſtance, or Nature of Bread, and Wine; and certainly the Image, and Reſemblance of Chriſt's Body and Blood, are celebrated in the Action of the Myſteries.* Bib. Patr. Tom. iv.

Theſe and ſome more of leſs Moment are, by the Dr. very much magnified and cry'd up; and, to do him juſtice, he ſpares no Art, nor Induſtry to improve them to the beſt Advantage; peremptorily concluding at the Foot of each Paſſage, that *Transubſtantiation* was unknown to Antiquity. But before I answer them, it will be requiſite, for the better Underſtanding of theſe Fathers, to obſerve.

1. *What Conduct the Ancient Fathers generally held, when they treated of the Myſtery of the Lord's Body and Blood, in the Sacrament.*

2.

## Transubstantiation.

2. *What was the Ancient Fathers Belief concerning this Mystery; and*

3. *Whence these Passages objected are taken :* Which if well consider'd, I doubt not to make it appear, that these Objections, notwithstanding their plausible Appearance, do not, in the least, prejudice the Truth of *Transubstantiation*, nor clash with the Fathers Opinions, who favour this Doctrine.

1. The Fathers here objected, and most of the Ancients, were very cautious how they spoke any thing on this Subject which might increase the Suspicion the Gentiles had conceiv'd of them, as if they us'd to eat Humane Flesh, in the Celebration of their Mysteries; which, no Doubt, was occasion'd by the Information of some Apostate *Christians*, who, upon renouncing of their Faith, declar'd, that the *Christians* us'd to eat the Flesh and Blood of *Christ*. They were therefore, to avoid the Reproach and *Odium*, which they must hereupon necessarily incur (the Gentiles thinking they eat this Flesh, as Men do that, which is sold in the Shambles) very careful to conceal this Mystery; and to write nothing, that was to be expos'd to the Infidels, which might seem to insinuate any such Doctrine; being content to glance at it, and (when they must) to deliver their Thoughts obscurely; knowing very well, that, by this prudent Conduct, the Pagans wou'd have no just Reason to reproach them, and the *Christians*, who were carefully instructed in this Point, wou'd easily understand what they hinted at. So that, in the Treatises against Hereticks,



Hereticks, in the Books they must have expos'd to publick View, for the Comfort, and Instruction of the *Christians*, and the Conversion of the Gentiles; but more especially in their publick Sermons and Homilies, where they apprehended any Pagans were present, they were very careful to speak nothing out, touching this Point; but by Hints and Glances, to insinuate their Meaning to the *Christians*, so as the Pagans cou'd not understand what they meant. Thus *Tertullian*, in the Book, which he wrote to dissuade his Wife from marrying after his Decease; *Non sciet Maritus quid ante omnem Cibum gustes, & si sciverit, Panem esse credet, & non quod dicitur. Your Husband will not know That, Which you taste before all other Meat; and if he does, he will think It is Bread, and not what It is call'd.* Here a Pagan knows not what he means, but his Wife, and all other *Christians* might easily understand, that he means the *Body of Christ*. Thus *S. Austin*, in several Places insinuates this Mystery in obscure Words, and then adds, these fam'd Words: *Nôrunt Fideles, Nôrunt Fideles quod dico: The Faithful know, The Faithful know what I say.* Thus *Theodoret* in that very Dialogue objected by the Doctor puts these Words in *Orthodoxus* his Mouth; *Oro te ut obscurius respondeas, adsunt enim fortasse aliqui Mysterijs non initiati. I beseech you answer obscurely; for there are some perhaps here present, who are not initiated in the Mysteries.* This he said, because they were about to talk of the *Eucharist*, as appears by the Words of the Dialogue. *Erani-*  
*stes*

*ſtes* answers him; *Sic audiam, & ſic respondebo: So I will hear, and ſo I will answer.*

It were needleſs to bring any more Authorities from Fathers to prove this Truth, it, being evident from the Conduct obſerv'd in reſpect of the Catechumens, that this was the univerſal Practice of the Primitive Church. Theſe Catechumens were Candidates for *Chriſtianity*; they were taught and inſtructed in all the other Myſteries of the *Chriſtian Faith*; but not one Word did they hear of, or relating to the *Eucharist*, till they had, by long Trial and Experience, given ſufficient Proof of their good Reſolutions, and ſolemnly promis'd to believe, whatever the *Catholic Church* taught and profeſs'd. Tho' they were taught the Myſtery of the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*; tho' they were allow'd to hear the *Gospel* read and expounded, and to aſſiſt at the reſt of the Divine Service; yet, when the Conſecration, and Communion of the *Eucharist* was to be perform'd, they were by no means admitted to be preſent, nor as much as know any thing of it; but were diſmiſs'd, and excluded from that part of the Service, till by long, and careful Inſtructions they were deem'd *Competent* \* to aſſiſt at it, as they then phraſ'd it. So careful were the Primitive Fathers, that none ſhou'd come to the Knowledge of this Myſtery, but ſuch as were very well diſpos'd to believe and embrace it.

\* Hence the Name of Competentes & Miſſa Catechumenorum ſo often mention'd by the Canons.

And now can any Man of Senſe imagine, that theſe Holy and Learned Fathers ſhou'd keep ſuch a ſtir about the *Eucharist*, or be ſo careful

careful to conceal it, were it but Type, or Figure of the Body and Blood of *Christ*? What is more easy to be believ'd, than that Bread represents the Body of *Christ*, and Wine, His Blood; and that both are taken in remembrance of His Death, and Passion? Surely, there is nothing in the World so easy to be persuaded; since all Mankind knows, that such arbitrary Signs or Representations, depend meerly of the Will of him that institutes them; and that there is nothing to be done to persuade their Belief, but to tell, that they are so. Certainly no Pagan; or Gentile cou'd ever be offended at a thing so plain or offer the least Reproach to the *Christian Religion* upon the account of it. Consequently there wou'd be no need to conceal, or speak obscurely of it; nor to hinder, not only Catechumen, but even Pagans, or Infidels to hear it taught and deliver'd. But to proceed:

2. What the Ancient Fathers believ'd, touching the *Eucharist*, was this; that the Substance of the Bread and Wine, was chang'd in the Body and Blood of *Christ*, as appears by the Passages produc'd from their Works, where the Fathers, in their Catechisms and Homilies, make it their Business to explain this Mystery to the Faithful. And because their Senses gave them to understand, that the Outward Forms, or Accidents remain'd; these they call'd the Sign, or Figure of *Christ's* Body; because they represent unto us the Body of *Christ*, Which is, as it were cloath'd with these Accidents. So  
that



that the Ancient Fathers believ'd this Sacrament to be both the Figure, and Reality of the Body of *Christ*, according to the Two different things they discover'd in it; viz. *The Outward Signs or Symbols, and the Body and Blood of Christ*, which are veil'd and cover'd by them. Hence *S. Cyril of Jerusalem* says; *Under the Type and Figure of Bread He gives you His Body, and under the Figure of Wine He gives you His Blood.* And *Gratian Distinct. 2 C. Hoc est de Consecrat.* says, *Hoc est quod dicimus, &c.* This is what we say, and what by all means we endeavour to prove; that the Sacrifice of the Church is made of 2 things, consists of Two things; of the visible Appearance of the Elements, and of the Invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord *J. Christ*; of the Sacrament, that is, of the External and Sacred Sign; and of the Thing of the Sacrament, *Re Sacramenti*, that is, of the Flesh and Blood of *Christ*. Again, *Caro Ejus est, &c.* 'Tis His Flesh, Which we receive in the Sacrament, veil'd with the Form of Bread; and His Blood, Which we drink, under the Appearance, and Taste of Wine. But for all, the Fathers do very often, especially in their Disputes with Hereticks, and when they apprehend their Writings shou'd fall into the Hands of the Pagans, call the *Eucharist*, *The Sign, or Figure of Christ's Body and Blood*; because in effect it is so, in regard of the Accidents, or Outward Forms; yet we do not find, that they ever call'd it *A Sign, or Figure* only, with Exclusion to the Reality of *Christ's* Flesh and Blood.

3. 'Tis very material to our present Dispute to know whence those Passages objected by the Dr. are taken. And this he himself is careful to tell us, namely, that they are taken out of those Fathers Disputes with Hereticks; in which sort of Writing, it is natural for any Man to take all kind of just Advantage of his Adversary, in order to confute him, even to the silencing of some part of the Truth, when it is not to his Purpose, nor absolutely necessary to be declar'd. So that it is very hard to gather those Fathers Opinions from such Passages, much more to establish an Article of Faith upon their ambiguous Expressions. Whereas the Passages, which we alledge for *Transubstantiation*, are taken from Catechisms, Homilies, Sermons, and familiar Discourses, where the Fathers on purpose, and as Pastors, and Doctors of the Church, expound this Mystery to the People, and tell them what they are to believe concerning it. This suppos'd.

1. I answer, 1. That *Tertullian* here disputed with an Heretick, and that, at such a time, as was neither convenient, nor agreeable to his Prudence, to publish the whole Truth concerning this Mystery: Consequently that it is not to be admir'd he spoke somewhat obscurely. 2. That by these Words; *This is My Body*. That is, *The Figure of My Body*, He meant the Outward Forms, or Accidents of the Sacrament: For he knew very well, that the *Sacrament* consisted of Two things, viz. *Of the Outward Accidents, or Forms of Bread and Wine*, and *Of the Body and Blood*

## Transubstantiation.

*Blood of Christ*, contain'd under these Accidents. The First *Tertullian* calls *The Figure of Christ's Body*, and so do all the *Roman Catholics* at present; because these Outward Forms exhibit, and represent unto us the Body and Blood of *Christ*, Which they cover. Now this gave *Tertullian* a signal Advantage over his Antagonist, who deny'd, that *Christ* had a Real Body; because it prov'd, that the *Sacrament* cou'd not be call'd *The Figure of Christ's Body*, unless He had a True and Real Body; and therefore he insisted upon it, without declaring what was contain'd under that Figure; which (tho' it may be blameable in a Sermon, or Discourse designed for the Instruction of the People, yet) may very well be allow'd in a Dispute, considering the Advantage it gave to his Cause, on the one side, but without Prejudice to Truth; and the Scorn and Contempt it wou'd expose the *Christian Religion* to, on the other, had he at that time of day, fully expounded that Mystery. Now that *Tertullian* did not believe, that the *Sacrament* was a Figure only, with Exclusion to the Reality of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, is evident from that Passage before cited, *Non sciet Maritus, &c.*

2. *S. Austin's* Words are to be understood in the same Sense: For he here disputed with *Adimantus* the *Manichean* who affirm'd that the Soul, or Life of Animals consisted in their Blood. Now *S. Austin* to refute this Errour, tells him, that the Blood of Animals, in *Scripture*, is taken for their Life; because it represents and contains Life. And



fo, says he, God calls Blood, *Soul* or *Life*; For our Lord did not doubt to say, This is My Body, when He gave the Sign of His Body. Which Words, surely, if the Comparifon be juft, muft fignifie, That that Sign of Chrift's Body, contain'd His True Body; as the Blood, which is the Sign of the Soul, or Life in Animals, contains their Life or Soul.

But that the Dr. may fee how far St. *Au-  
stin* was from believing, that the *Sacrament*  
was only a Sign or Figure of *Chrift's Body*; I  
will tranfcribe a Paflage taken out of his Com-  
ments upon the *Pfalms* where he fpeaks  
plainly and familiarly for the Peoples Inſtru-  
ction. 'Tis upon thefe Words of the *Pfalmiſt*;  
*Adorate Scabellum Pedum Ejus quoniam Sanctum*  
*eſt; Adore ye His Footſtool* becauſe it is Holy.  
Behold Brethren, ſays he, what he com-  
mands us to adore: The *Scripture* ſaith elſe-  
where, *Heaven is My Seat, but the Earth*  
*is My Footſtool*: He commands us then to a-  
dore the *Earth*; becauſe he ſaid in ano-  
ther Place, that the *Earth* was God's *Foot-  
ſtool*; and now ſhall we adore the *Earth*,  
ſince the *Scripture* expreſſly ſays, *Thou ſhalt*  
*adore thy Lord thy God*? And this (*Pfalmiſt*)  
ſays, *Adore ye His Footſtool*: But explaining  
to me what His Footſtool is, He ſaith:  
*The Earth is My Footſtool*, I am at a ſtand  
I fear to adore the *Earth*, leſt He ſhou'd  
damn me, Who made *Heaven* and *Earth*.  
Again I fear, if I do not adore the *Foot-  
ſtool* of my Lord; becauſe the *Pſalm* ſays  
to me, *Adore ye His Footſtool*. I aſk what His  
Footſtool is, and the *Scripture* tells me:

" *The Earth is My Footstool.* Being in doubt;  
 " I turn me to *Christ*; for 'tis He whom I  
 " here seek, and I find, how without Impi-  
 " ety the *Earth* may be ador'd. For He took  
 " *Earth* of *Earth*; because *Flesh* is of *Earth*;  
 " and He took *Flesh* of *Mary's* *Flesh*; and  
 " because He here walk'd in that *Flesh*, and  
 " gave us that *Flesh* to eat for our Salvation.  
 " But no Man eats it except he first adores it.  
 " It is found how such a Footstool of the  
 " Lord may be ador'd; and we do not on-  
 " ly not sin, in adoring it, but we shou'd sin  
 " if we do not adore it. *Enar. in Psal. xcvi.*

Here St. *Austin* says, that *Christ* gave us  
 that *Flesh* to eat, in Which he walk'd here  
 on *Earth*; and that we are so far from Sin,  
 in adoring that *Flesh*, that we sin if we do  
 not adore it. *Christ* walk'd here in the *Flesh*,  
 and He gave us that *Flesh* to eat; and we shall  
 sin if we do not adore that *Flesh*, says this Fa-  
 ther. What *Flesh* did *Christ* here walk in?  
 Was it in the Sign or Figure of His *Flesh*?  
 No sure, 'twas in His Real *Flesh*. 'Tis evi-  
 dent then, that *Christ* gave us His Real *Flesh*,  
 in this Father's Sense. Here S. *Austin* speaks  
 plainly, and familiarly to the Common Peo-  
 ple; here is no Dispute in the Case, no Ad-  
 vantage to be taken of a Sophistical Here-  
 tick; no Fear of expounding the Mystery to  
 the full: Consequently he spoke his Mind  
 plainly. In a word, he must have lost his Rea-  
 son, who does not see, that it is from such  
 Passages as this, where the Fathers speak to  
 their Flock and expound the *Scriptures*, and  
 the Mysteries of our Religion, that we are to  
 learn

learn, what they hold concerning any Point of Faith; and not from some abstruse, and dark Expressions call'd out of their Disputes with Hereticks; were the Fathers purposely design to conceal the Depth of this Mystery, whenever they must mention it. But the Truth of the Matter is, the Doctor's Cause wou'd afford him no better Arguments, and rather than fail, he was resolv'd to catch at any thing.

3. *Theodoret*, and *Gelasius* their Words are likewise to be understood of the Accidents, or Outward Forms of the *Sacrament*.

That these Fathers gave the Name of Substance, and Nature to the Accidents will appear, if we consider the Equivocation of the Word *Symbol*, here mention'd by *Theodoret*. This Word is sometimes taken for the Bread and Wine it self before Consecration, and sometimes, but most properly, for the External Form, and Appearance of Bread and Wine, which remain after Consecration. *Eranistes*, or the *Eutychian Heretick* took it in the First Sense, and therefore affirm'd, that, *As the Symbols after Consecration were chang'd into another thing; so the Body of our Lord after His Ascension, is chang'd into the Divine Substance*. This he said of the *Sacrament*, because he was so taught, and because he knew there was no Difference between him, and the *Orthodoxus* on that Subject. But what does the *Orthodoxus*, to take advantage by that Similitude? Why, he takes the Word *Symbol* in its more proper Meaning, namely *For the Accidents, or Outward Forms*, and tells the He-



tick, *He is caught in his own Net; because,* says he, *the Mystical Symbols after Consecration, do not pass out of their own Nature; for they remain in their former Substance, Figure, and Appearance, and may be seen and handled as before.* Now, that by the Mystical Symbols, he meant the Accidents, methinks 'tis plain; for the Reason he gives, why these Symbols are not chang'd, is, *Because they may be seen and handled as before.* But this proves plainly, that he must have meant the Accidents, since only Accidents can be seen and felt. Nor does it move me, that he seems to give partly for his Reason, that the Substance of the Symbols remain; for that is said *Gratis*, and cou'd never be prov'd, if he had meant the real Substance of the Bread. Besides, there is nothing more common in Humane Language, than to give the Denomination of Substance to meer Accidents; as we usually say, *The Substance of his Discourse was this; The Substance of what he said, &c.* tho' all Discourses and Sayings, are pure Accidents. And however this Solution, at first sight, may seem strange, yet, whoever will take the pains to examine well the Sayings of both these Disputants, and believes they were in their Wits, he cannot possibly deny what I say to be true. The one positively affirms of the Symbols, that they are chang'd into another thing; the other as stiffly maintains, that they do not change at all. I ask now, whether these Symbols are Objects of Sense, or not? If you say they are. I ask again, whether Two Men in their Wits, and Senses, can be

so mistaken in a plain Object of Sense, as to affirm contradictory things of it at once? For Instance: Can Two Men be so mistaken about a White Wall, which they plainly see, as that one shou'd affirm it is White, and the other, that it is not? 'Tis plain they cannot: 'Tis then manifest, that if the Symbols be Objects of Sense, *Eranistes* and *Orthodoxus*, did not both consider them as such; otherwise they must have lost their Reason, to affirm such contradictory things of them at once. 'Tis then evident, that *Eranistes*, who affirm'd, the Symbols were chang'd, did not consider them as the Objects of Sense, otherwise he must have spoken contrary to the Evidence of his own Senses: Consequently his Meaning was, that the Change happen'd in the Substance of the Bread, and not in the Accidents. 'Tis no less evident, on the other hand, that *Orthodoxus* consider'd the Symbols, as Objects of Sense, else he cou'd, with no Colour of Reason, affirm, that they did not pass out of their Nature, Substance, &c. For, let us suppose with the Dr. that he meant the real Substance of the Symbols, or *Bread and Wine*: How does he prove that there is no real Change in them? *Because the Mystical Symbols*, says he, *do not pass out of their own Nature, for they remain in their former Substance, &c.* This is only said, but wants to be prov'd. Well! How does he prove it? *Because*, continues he, *they may be seen, and handled, as before.* Why this the Heretick *Eranistes* acknowledges; and yet he affirms, that the Symbols are chang'd: And,

which is more, he therefore believes, that it is the real Substance of the Symbols, and not the Accidents that are chang'd; because the Accidents *may be seen, and handled, as before*. And now, wou'd it not be a very pleasant Way to persuade him, that the Substance of the Bread and Wine was not chang'd, for that very Reason, for which he believ'd it was? Or let us suppose that they both consider'd the Symbols as the true, and real Substance of the Bread and Wine, and not as Accidents, or Objects of our Senses: Well! What follows? The Heretick *Eranistes* affirms, that the Symbols, in this Sense, were chang'd, tho' he saw with his Eyes the Accidents were not; and then how cou'd the *Orthodoxus* convince him by his own Words, or tell him, *He was caught in his own Net*; unless he cou'd prove to him, that the Symbols taken in that Sense were not chang'd? But this he is so far from doing, that the Reason he offers, to evince that he was so caught, proves no more, than that the Accidents, or Objects of Sense still remain, namely, *That which may be seen and handled*; which the Heretick *Eranistes* never deny'd. 'Tis then evident, that he understood the Word *Symbol* in a different Sense from that of *Eranistes*. Consequently his Meaning must have been, that the Accidents, which he calls *Symbols*, *did not pass out of their Nature, &c.* And all his Advantage consisted in the Equivocation of the Word *Symbol*, which his Adversary took in a vulgar Sense, and by that, gave him an Opportunity



portunity to perplex him, and to tell him *He was caught in his own Net.* And, God knows, he must be hard put to it, who would fain squeeze Proof for his Faith from such intricate Disputes.

I have nothing to add, in answer to *Gelasius* his Passage, to what is here said: For 'tis plain from the Scope and Design of this Father (who likewise disputed with an *Eutychian Heretick*) that he meant, by *Substance or Nature of Bread, the Qualities of it*, which (we confess) remain still in the *Sacrament*; nothing being more usual in common Discourse, than to give the Name of *Nature* to the Quality, as we commonly say, *A Man of Ill Nature*, that is, *Of Ill Qualities*.

One Word more with the Doctor, and I take leave of this Subject.

He tells us: *Discourse against Transubstantiation, Pag. 328, 329.* That *Transubstantiation* was first introduc'd into the *Catholick Religion*, about the Latter End of the Eighth Century in the *Second Council of Nice*. And *Pag. 333.* That it was almost 300 Years before *this Mischapen Monster*, as he religiously terms it, cou'd be lick'd into that Form in which it is now settled and establish'd in the *Church of Rome*.

What I shall say to the Matter of Fact here mention'd (leaving the Dr. to his own Master to account for his civil Language) is, that I cou'd wish he were alive, that he might now, at least, consult his own *Protestant Authors* to correct his Errour, since he was then in too much haste to do it. Doctor

*Humfrey,*

*Jesuitismi Part II.* *Humfrey*, a Famous Divine of his own Country, and Persuasion, wou'd better inform him, that *Austin the Great Monk*, as he calls him, sent by Gregory the Great Pope, taught the English a Burthen of Ceremonies—Purgatory, Mass, Prayer for the Dead, Transubstantiation, Reliques, &c. Now all the World knows, that *Austin the Monk* taught the English about the Latter End of the viith Century, and the Beginning of the viith, almost 200 Years before the *Second Council of Nice*.

*Cent. vi. De Oper. Sti Greg.* The *Centurators of Magdeburgh*, the Doctor's own good Friends, wou'd tell him, that the same *Gregory the Great* wrought a Miracle in the Presence of an incredulous Woman, to confirm her in the Belief of the substantial Change of the Bread into the Body of *Christ*, as the *Centurists* phrase it. And, surely, it was no less these Gentlemens Interest than his (cou'd they but divest themselves of all Honesty and Sincerity) to make it of a fresher Date, than even the *Council of Nice*. But the Dr. was so intent upon basking *Monsieur Arnould's* Demonstration, Of the Impossibility of obtruding this Doctrine upon the Faithful, without great, and violent Commotions, both in Church and State, which, he saw, he cou'd not well effect, unless he had fix'd a certain *Epocha*, whence this Doctrine shou'd take its Rise, that rather than fail, he wou'd hit at a venture upon the *Second Council of Nice*, and there fix his Foot: Being persuaded, as he says, that this was the fittest Time for such a Change. And is not this a miserable Shift to which this ingenious Man

Man is reduc'd, when he is forc'd (to make good his Undertaking) to have recourse to such known, and manifest (I am asham'd to say it) Falshoods? Which surely do better become Impostors than grave Divines, whose very Names, and Character, shou'd prompt them to Candour and Sincerity; it being evident, that Disingenuity, and False Dealing (whatever they may do for a time) serve to no other End at last, than to discredit the Cause, and confound its Patrons.

---

C H A P. V.

*Of the Communion in One Kind.*

**T**O give the *Communion in One*, or in Both *Kinds*, is no Matter of Faith, but respects the Discipline of the Church, which, according to the different Circumstances, and Exigencies of Affairs, for the Increase of Piety and Devotion, and in Condescension to the Infirmary of her Children, is often necessitated to alter some things in her Discipline; it being evident, that what in one Age was good and profitable, another Age will in no wise bear. And since it is agreed upon, that the Care of feeding the Flock was committed to the Church; that she alone is commission'd to dispense the Divine Mysteries, and hath a peculiar Promise of the Assistance of the *Holy Spirit* to guide her into all Truth; none can reasonably doubt, but she is the most competent Judge, what in her Discipline to change, what to retain.

Now the main Stress lies upon this; *Whether or no it be in the power of the Church to alter*



ter her Discipline, in a Matter of this Importance, so as to restrain the Faithful to the receiving of the Sacrament in One Kind only? It being acknowledg'd by our selves, that, in the Primitive Times, this Sacrament was indifferently administer'd, sometimes in Both, sometimes in One Kind: Tho' 'tis hard to conceive, why Men shou'd rather conclude, that it is not in the power of the Church to restrain the Faithful to One Kind; because the Communion was sometimes given in Both, than the contrary, That it is in the power of the Church so to do; because it was likewise sometimes given in One Kind? To justify then the Conduct of the Church in this Particular, I shall only examine, whether the receiving of the *Eucharist*, in Both Kinds, be essential to a true, and real Participation of the Sacrament? For if both Kinds be essential, then 'tis certain, the Church cannot take away any essential Part of the Sacrament without destroying the whole; and consequently in giving but part, wou'd give nothing at all: Therefore cou'd not restrain the Faithful to One Kind; it being evident that the Church is only impower'd to dispense, and not to destroy the Mysteries of God. But if I can make out, that the Participation of the *Eucharist*, in Both Kinds, is not essential to the worthy receiving the Sacrament, then it will evidently follow, that the Church may lawfully command the Forbearance of One Kind. For if you shou'd ask any of our Learned Protestants, why they do not give the Communion at Night, or after Supper, or  
 sitting

sitting down, or lying on Couches, as, 'tis confess'd *Christ* gave it? They will tell you; because 'tis not essential to the Sacrament to give it so. Or why they do not plunge the Children into the Water, when they baptise them, as the Apostles, and Primitive Church have done? They answer, as before, that it is not essential to the Spiritual Location of the Soul, that the Body shou'd be wash'd by plunging, rather than any other way; but, that whether it be perform'd by Immersion or Asperision, or in any other Manner, 'tis the same thing to all the Intents and Purposes of the Sacrament; so that it is plain, and even confess'd by our Adversaries, that *the Church* has power to alter, and change all the Circumstances, which are not of the Essence, and Nature of the Sacraments. All the Difficulty then consists in this, *Whether it be essential to the Communion to receive It in Both Kinds? Or whether One Kind be not sufficient?* And if it be made out, that it is not essential to the Communion to receive *Both*; but that It is enough to receive It in *One Kind*, then the *Protestants* must confess, that the Church may lawfully command the Forbearance of the other.

Now, that the receiving of the *Eucharist*, in Both Kinds, is not essential to the true, and real Participation of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, to all the Intents, and Purposes of the Sacrament; but that *One Kind* alone is sufficient, as I shall endeavour to shew;

1. *From several Texts of Scripture which affords us sufficient Grounds to conclude, that for the*

## The Communion in One Kind.

*the due Participation of the Sacrament, it is not necessary to receive it in Both Kinds.*

2. *From the general Practice of the Church in all Ages; even in those Days, in which the Protestants do own, the Pure Word of God (as they speak) was preach'd, and the Sacraments duely administer'd.*

3. *From the Consent of our Adversaries, if consistent with themselves. I begin with the First.*

And that our Adversaries may not think, I design to impose upon them, I will quote those Places of *Scripture*, that seem to make against, as well as for me. *Christ* says, *John C. vi. V. 50. This is the Bread Which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof, and not die. V. 51. I am the Living Bread Which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever; and the Bread That I will give is My Flesh. V. 53. Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no Life in you. V. 54. Who so eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath Eternal Life. V. 56. He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in Him. V. 58. This is that Bread, Which came down from Heaven— He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever.* Here are Six Passages, whereof Three seem to be expressly for the *Communion in One Kind*, and the other Three seem to be against it. What shall we say to this? Must we believe all? Or shall we believe but Three of them? For they seem to contradict one another. One says, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man,*  
and



and drink His Blood, ye have no Life in you. Another; *If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever*: If it be true, that the *Man*, who *eateth of this Bread shall live for ever*, how can it be at the same time true, that he cannot live, except he eat the *Bread*, and drink the *Cup*? Must we then hold to Three of these Passages and reject the rest? As to the *Protestants*, I do not see, how it shou'd stand with their Principles to do otherwise. For they are so far from believing, that the *Man*, who *eats of this Bread shall live for ever*, that they constantly assert, that except he drinks also of the *Cup*, he is guilty of a horrid Sacrilege; 'tis what Dr. Tillotson expressly affirms. *This is no Addition to Christianity* (says Vol. II.  
Page. 70. he speaking of the *Communion in One Kind*) but a *Sacrilegious Taking away of an essential Part of the Sacrament*; they must then necessarily deny Three of these Passages, if they be true to their own Principles. But for *R. Catholicks*, they are not in the least perplex'd at this seeming Contradiction; they believe them all to be both true in themselves, and agreeable to their Principles: For they believe, that whosoever *eateth of this Bread*, the same *eateth and drinketh the Flesh and Blood of the Son of Man*, in the Sense He meant they shou'd eat and drink His Flesh and Blood; which is not to be understood (as *Protestants* as well as *Catholicks* must confess, tho' upon different Grounds) in the strict and proper Meaning of the Words, as if eating and drinking His Flesh and Blood were to be perform'd by Two different Acts, whereof

whereof one is conversant about a solid, and the other about a liquid thing, as the Words usually and properly import; but that to eat and drink His Flesh and Blood, signifies no more than to participate of, or to take by the Mouth His Flesh and Blood, whether with One, or Different Acts it matters not. *R. Catholicks* then find no Difficulty in reconciling these Places; they believe the Flesh of *Jesus Christ* is the Flesh of a Living Man, which cannot be so without Blood; and therefore, when they take It, they are sure, they eat and drink His Body and Blood, that is, *They are Partakers of His Body and Blood.* And hence it is, they do most certainly conclude, that it is not essential to the *Communion* to receive it in Both Kinds; because they receive in One, all that *Christ* requires of the Faithful to receive, that is, *His Body and Blood.* I say *Protestants* as well as *Catholicks* must confess, that in this Passage, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood,* the Words *Eat* and *Drink*, are not to be taken in the strict, and usual Sense they commonly bear: For seeing they believe, that, in the *Eucharist*, there is neither Flesh nor Blood, nothing but Bread and Wine; and that in eating and drinking these Elements to the Letter, they do eat, and drink the Body and Blood of *Christ*, by Faith, as it is said in the 39 *Articles*, it cannot be said, that they eat and drink the Flesh and Blood of *Christ*, in the Literal and Usual Sense of the Words, it being impossible to eat and drink in the Elements, in a Literal Sense,

Sense, that, which in a Literal Sense, they do not really contain, as *Protestants* hold. They must then necessarily conclude, that to eat and drink the Body and Blood of *Christ*, is not to be understood in a Literal, but in a Figurative Sense; and then the Meaning of these Words must be, *To eat, and drink the Body and Blood of Christ*; that is, *To be Partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ*, and if so, then 'tis certain, that in eating only the Body of *Christ*, Which, being a Living Humane Body, must needs contain His Blood, we eat and drink His Flesh and Blood, that is, *We are made Partakers of His Flesh and Blood*, which surely, is all that is requisite to the Essence or Nature of the Sacrament.

And now, who wou'd believe, that the *R. Catholicks* had such Grounds, in *Scripture*, for the *Communion in One Kind*, considering the loud, and clamorous Accusations, yea and the horrible *Sacrileges* they are charg'd with, upon this Subject? Well! And who are those, who charge us thus? Why they are Great, and Eminent Men: Great indeed, not only for the Rank, and Station wherein the Powers of this World have placed them; but also Great for their Learning, and other excellent Endowments. But then, 'tis that they must so do: The *Protestant Religion* (as all the World knows) was planted in these Kingdoms by open Force and Violence. These Gentlemens Predecessours possess'd themselves of the rich Benefices of the Church; and when Mens Interest, and Honour, are once engag'd, 'tis hard, if they do not stand by them.

M

Now



Now there is no Way left to justify these Proceedings, but by railing at the *Church of Rome*, and exposing her pretended Corruptions; and therefore 'tis no Marvel, they shou'd lay these, and a great deal more to her Charge. But take away these fatal Biases: Let Benefices be laid aside: Let the Riches of the Church be propos'd as the Reward of Virtue, and Merit; and then we shall see how many Eyes this will open; then we shall see the Scales fall off, and those, who have been hitherto our greatest Persecutors, become, like *S. Paul*, the most zealous Assertors of our Faith and Religion. But this by the way.

*Chap. xxiv*

There is another Passage in *S. Luke*, which favours the *Communion in One Kind*. This Evangelist tells us, that *Christ*, after His Resurrection, appear'd to Two of His Disciples, as they went to *Emaus*, who, adds *St. Luke*, constrain'd Him to abide with them; and when He sat at Meat, He took Bread, and bless'd it, and brake and gave to them, and their Eyes were open'd, and they knew Him, and He vanish'd out of their Sight. Now, 'tis certain, that, if this Bread, which *Christ* bless'd and brake, was the *Eucharist*, we have, at least, One Instance in which *Christ* Himself gave the *Communion in One Kind*. For 'tis said, that after He had broke the Bread, and gave it to them, He vanish'd out of their Sight. And indeed, it is very hard to conceive how the Breaking of ordinary Bread, as 'tis usually done at Meat, shou'd open these Disciples Eyes, so as to know Him

That

That did it to be *Christ*. Besides the *Breaking of Bread*, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, is always understood of the *Communion*; and *St. Chrysostom*, *S. Augustine*, *Venerable Bede*, and *Theophilactus*, in their *Comments* upon this Place, teach us, that this Bread, Which *Christ* brake, was the *Eucharist*; which surely they wou'd not have done, had there been the least Doubt of the Lawfulness of the *Communion in One Kind*. However, because it is not thus interpreted by the universal Consent of the Church, I shall lay no more Weight upon it, than it can reasonably bear; leaving the Reader to judge, what Impression the Authority of Four such Great Men, so well read in Antiquity, is apt to make upon an unprejudic'd Mind. I now proceed to shew, that the *Communion*, in Both Kinds, is not essential to the Sacrament.

2. " From the general Practice of the Church in all Ages, even in those Days wherein the *Protestants* do confess, the *Pure Word of God* was preach'd, and the *Sacraments* duely administer'd.

The *Protestants* do pretend to pay a great deal of Respect, and Veneration to Antiquity; and in all their Debates, and Controversies in Religion, whether with us, or among themselves, they are willing to appeal to the Primitive Church, which they look upon as the Rule and Measure of their Faith and Practice. Now, if it appears by the Practice of the Primitive Church, that the *Communion* was given in *One Kind* without the other, and that this was neither

prohibited by the Governours of the Church, nor found fault with by the People, nor yet wrote against by any Man whatsoever, then 'tis but reasonable to hope, that every ingenious *Protestant* will easily be persuaded, that neither the Pastors, nor the People of the Primitive Church did ever believe, that both Kinds were essential to the worthy Participation of the Sacrament. This I shall, by God's Assistance endeavour to evince from the best Records and the most unquestionable Witnesses, and Writers of the Primitive Times.

And here I find Four Sorts of Communion; *The Communion of the Sick; the Communion of Infants, and Little Children; the Communion of Private Families*, commonly call'd *The Domestick Communion*; and the *Publick Solemn Communion of the Church*. And in regard of all these, I shall undertake to prove, that, for the First 600 Years, the *Eucharist* was given, 1. In the *Communion of the Sick*, under the *Species* of Bread alone. 2. In the *Communion of Infants, and Little Children*, under the *Species* of Wine alone. 3. In the *Domestick, or Private Communion*, under the *Species* of Bread; but so as to be sometimes given, tho' seldom in Both Kinds: And lastly, in the *Publick and Solemn Communion of the Church*, sometimes in One, sometimes in Both Kinds, as the Piety and Devotion of the People carry'd them to participate of One or Both.

*Hist. Eccles. Lib. vi. Cap. lxxiv.*

Touching the *Communion of the Sick*. *Eusebius*, one of the best, and most celebrated Historians of the Primitive Church, gives us an entire



entire Letter of the Great *Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria* upon this Subject. In this Letter, *Dionysius* relates the Story of a certain Old Man call'd *Serapion*, who being under publick Penance, and falling sick, sent a Boy to a Priest, that was at some Distance from him, to desire him to come to him, and give him the Sacred *Communion* before he had departed this Life; but the Priest happening at the same time to be sick, and not able to go so far, gave a Piece of the *Sacred Bread* to the Boy, and order'd him to carry it to *Serapion*, and enjoin'd him moreover to moisten it in some Liquor, and then to give it to him as his Last *Viaticum*; which when he had done, saith *Dionysius*, the Good Old Man immediately gave up the Ghost.

Here is a *Communion in One Kind* related by a Man, who was as Great a Saint as he was a Bishop, and recorded by another Great, and Learned Bishop: Both very ancient Witnesses, both much celebrated by Antiquity. Yet neither the one, nor the other finds any fault with the Priest, nor with *Serapion* for this *Communion*, which our Adversaries wou'd now abhor as Sacrilegious and Detestable; on the contrary, they both admire the Goodness of God, as the said Letter witnesseth, in sparing this poor Man's Life till he had receiv'd the *Sacred Pledge of His Redemption*. And now, can it be imagin'd that these Two Great Men, who liv'd so near the Times of the Apostles, and were so well instructed in the Faith and Discipline of the Church, shou'd not rather be surpris'd

surpris'd at the Rashness of the Priest, than admire the Mercy of God in this Affair, if the Practice and Discipline of the Church had not authoris'd such a *Communion*? Nay that *Eusebius*, who was so nice and severe in his Remarks, and Censures upon the least Slips, and Mistakes of other Clergymen, shou'd be silent in a Business of this Weight, is sure what no Man can reasonably suppose. This the *Protestants* cou'd not but see; and therefore the most ingenious among them, as *Bishop Jewel*, \* *Mr. Smith* † and others have freely confess'd that the *Communion* here mention'd, was given only in *One Kind*: But others, who resolve to say any thing rather than acknowledge the Truth, wou'd maintain, that that Liquor wherein the Boy was order'd to moisten the Piece of the *Sacred Bread*, was the *Consecrated Wine*; whereas it is plain from the Words of the Letter, the Priest gave him no Liquor at all, but order'd him to steep the *Sacred Bread* in any Liquor he cou'd find at home. Besides, suppose he had dipp'd the Bread in the *Sacred Wine*, and gave it so to the Sick Man; no *Protestant*, who understands the Principles of his Religion, will say, that this is to eat, and drink the Flesh and Blood of *Christ*. For *Protestants* hold, that it is therefore necessary to eat and drink the Elements apart; because in so doing, they shew the Death of our Lord, Whose Body was broken, and separated from His Blood. But this Evasion is so vain and groundless, that it merits no further Confutation.

\* *Ans.*  
to Hard.  
† *Epist.*  
*de Eccles.*  
*Græc. hoc*  
*Stat. pag.*  
197.

Another

Another Instance of this Communion, is that of S. *Ambrose*. We have this Great Bishop's Life written by *Paulinus* his own Deacon, who was present at his Death, and dedicated his Life to St. *Austin*, at whose Request he wrote it; so that his Authority is beyond all Exception. This Deacon tells us, that S. *Honoratus* Bishop of *Verceil*, who came to visit St. *Ambrose*, as he lay on his Death-Bed, Heard, in the dead of the Night, a Voice say to him thrice, Arise, delay not; for he is going to depart. He came down, adds *Paulinus*, gave him the Body of our Lord, and the Saint no sooner receiv'd It \* when he gave up the Ghost. Here the Body of our Lord is given to S. *Ambrose*, but no Mention of His Blood: Here 'tis said, he no sooner receiv'd it when he gave up the Ghost. The Word *It* is remarkable; for being of the Singular Number, and denoting only one thing, it cannot be understood but of the Body to Which it refers; whereas if *Paulinus* had meant, that he had receiv'd the Body and Blood, under Both Species, he shou'd have spoken in the Plural Number, and said, He no sooner receiv'd Them, when he gave up the Ghost. Well what say our Adversaries to a Decision so plain? For something must be said. Some say S. *Ambrose* receiv'd the Communion as well as he cou'd, being prevented by a Sudden Death before he cou'd receive the Sacred Cup. Vain Fancy! As if the Divine Power, Which sent a Voice from Heaven to order the Communion to be given to him, cou'd not keep him alive till he had receiv'd the Sacrament entire-

\* Eoque  
reveren-  
tissime ac-  
cepto.



ly. Others, not satisfied with this Answer, say, St. *Ambrose* receiv'd Both Kinds, tho' *One* only is express'd, by the Grammatical Figure *Synecdoche*, where a Part is taken for the whole. But this is as groundless as the former: For, besides, that the precise and express Terms in which that Phrase is conceiv'd, will admit of no Figurative Sense, such Grammatical Figures are not us'd by any Ecclesiastical Writers, when they speak of the *Communion*; nor did any *Protestant* ever yet instance in One Single Passage where in it is so taken; which is an evident Argument that they had none to instance in. I might further instance in the *Council of Carthage*, in the *Communion* of St. *Basil*; but let this suffice for the *Communion of the Sick*; for I wou'd not be tedious.

The same Practice we find observ'd in the *Communion of Infants and Little Children*, only with this Difference, that, whereas the *Communion* was given to the Sick, under the *Species* of Bread, here it is given under the *Species* of Wine. And the reason of this Difference, I conceive was this. *In the Beginning*, whilst the Church groan'd under the Tyranny, and Persecution of the Pagan Emperours, and their Magistrates; the Bishops and Priests, being forc'd to wander from Place to Place, when they light upon any Christians with Little Children, or New-born Infants, being uncertain, whether they shou'd ever return that way again, they us'd to administer the Sacraments to them; the Bishops, the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist, and the Priests the

First

*First and the Last. And because the New-born Babes were not capable of receiving any thing that was solid, they gave them always the Eucharist under the Form of Wine. And this Custom, thus settled in the First Persecutions, continued in the Church until the Latter End of the Tenth Century; yet all this while it never enter'd into any Man's Head, to say, that this was an Imperfect, much less a Sacrilegious Communion.*

The First Instance we find of this Communion, is in St. Cyprian's Time, about the Year of our Lord 240. This Holy Martyr tells us what happen'd in his own Presence to a Little Girl, who had eaten a little of the Bread, that was offer'd to the Idols. Her Mother knowing nothing of what she had taken, carry'd her, as the Custom was, to the Place where the *Christians* were assembled. During the time of Prayer, adds this Father, this Child was troubled, and disorder'd, as if for want of Words (which her tender Age was not capable of) she wou'd by this means, declare the Misfortune which beset her. After the usual Solemnity, the Deacon, who presented the *Sacred Cup* to the Faithful, continues St. Cyprian, coming to the Rank where this Child was, she turn'd her Face aside, not being able to bear the Presence of such a Majesty. She shut her Mouth, she refus'd the Cup. But being compell'd to swallow some Drops of the Precious Blood, she was not able, pursues this Father, to hold it in her sully'd Entrails, but violently gave it up; so Great is the Power and Majesty of our Lord.

Tract.  
de Lapsis.

Here

*The Communion in One Kind.*

Here is a Fact so plain, that nothing can be added to it; all the Circumstances of it are attended with such Marks of a *Communion in One Kind*, that nothing but meer Prejudice, or rather Blindness, can make any Man doubt it. I know some *Protestants* have been so vain as to pretend, that this Child did receive the *Body of Christ*, before the Deacon came with the *Sacred Cup*; but this is so contrary to S. *Cyprian's* Design, in relating this surprising Story, that I wonder any Man, in his Senses, shou'd imagine it. What, a Child, that eat of the Sacrifice of Devils, is troubled and confounded (by the Instinct, do doubt, of the *Holy Ghost*, for Reason she was not capable of) because she was to partake of the *Cup of our Lord*! And wou'd she not, think you, be in the same Trouble and Confusion, were she to receive the *Lord's Body*? At the Presence of the *Sacred Cup*, she turns her Face aside, and shuts her Mouth, and that by Divine Instinct, for Reason she had not; her *sully'd Entrails* are not able to bear the *Majesty of our Lord* in His Blood, but are forc'd to give It up. And wou'd she have done less, at the Presence, and Participation of the same *Lord's Body*? Is the Majesty, or Power of the Lord's Body less than that of His Blood, that it shou'd not cause the like Disorder? At the Receiving of the *Lord's Blood*, here are a great many surprising Accidents; and why not the like at the Receipt of His *Body*? Truly the Reason is plain; because, in very deed, she neither did, nor was to receive the *Lord's Body* otherwise, than in the *Sacred Cup*. This



This Practice of giving the *Communion* to Children, under the *Species* of Wine, was not confin'd to the Three First Ages, but is still in force in the *Greek*, and continued in the *Latin Church* to the XII Century. Touching the *Greek Church*; *Allutius* † a *R. Catholic*, and Mr. *Smith* \* a *Church of England Divine*, tells us, Children are still communicated in that Church under the *Species* of Wine. As to the General Practice of the whole Church; *Jobius*, a Learned Author of the VI Century, gives us this Account of it, *Lib. iii. De Verb. Incarn. Cap. xviii.* where he speaks of the Three Sacraments conferr'd upon Little Children all at once. *We are* (says he) *first baptis'd, then we are anointed, that is, confirm'd, afterward the Precious Blood is given to us.* \* *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, a Learned Writer of the XI Century, and much commended by *S. Bernard*, says expressly, that the Practice of the Church was, to give the Children after Baptism, the *Sacrament* under the Form of Wine only; and teaches afterward, that the Body and Blood of *Christ* are wholly and intirely receiv'd in either Kind. Thus much concerning the *Communion of Infants*.

As to the *Domestick*, or *Private Communion*: For the Three First Centuries, whilst the Fervour of the Primitive Devotion lasted; and the Blood of *Jesus Christ* (as the Fathers speak) was *Reeking Hot*: The *Christians*, who being led like Sheep to the Slaughter, considering the *Sacred Eucharist*, as the Best, and most Efficacious Armour and Support,

to

† Tract. de Conf. utr. Eccles. Annotat. ad Com. Orient. \* Epist. de Eccles. Græc. hoc Statu. P. 104. Ed. 1 Bib. Pho. Cod. 222. \* Erud. Theo. L. iii. C. xx.

to enable them to bear up against the Fiery Trials they must undergo, were very careful, when they met, on Great Festivals, at their pious Assemblies, to carry home, every Man and Woman, as much of that *Sacred Food*, as wou'd suffice to take some part of it every Day; that being thereby united to *Jesus Christ*, they might be the better prepar'd for the Assaults of their violent Persecutors. And because these Holy Assemblies cou'd not be very frequent, in the Rage of Persecutions; nor the dispers'd *Christians*, who liv'd far off, come easily to them; and that the *Species* of the *Sacred Wine* was apt to be soon alter'd, especially in so small a Quantity, as they must have taken it; and besides, subject to other Accidents, which in those troublesome Times, they cou'd not well prevent; they were content to carry along with them the *Sacred Body of our Lord*, under the Form of Bread only; being persuaded, that when they eat of this Bread, they were Partakers of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and of the Grace and Sanctification thereunto annex'd. And here I shou'd tire the Reader's Patience, shou'd I bring all, that can be said in Confirmation of this Truth; but I shall instance only in some few of the best, and most approv'd Authors; for I perceive I have been longer upon this Subject than I design'd. *Tertullian*, a Learned Author of the II Century speaks thus of the *Private Communion*, in the Book, which he wrote to his Wife to dissuade her from marrying after his Death. *Thy Husband*, says he, *will*

not know That, Which thou takest before all other Meat, and if he shou'd, he will think It is Bread, and not what It is call'd; that is, The Body of Christ. Here Tertullian tells us, that his Wife, after the manner of other Christian Women, us'd to take a certain Thing, before she tasted any other Food; and that her Future Husband, whom he supposes a Pagan, if he shou'd know It, wou'd think it to be Bread; because It was so in appearance, tho' in reality It was the Body of Christ; but under the Form of Bread, and no other.

The Great S. Basil, a Greek Father of the IV Century, delivers this Practice more at large in his Letter to *Casaria*, who, it seems, Epist. 289 wou'd know, whether it was Lawful to receive the Communion otherwise, than by the Hands of a Priest, or Deacon. To which he answers thus; *As to this, that it is not grievous to take the Communion with one's own Hands, when there is no Priest nor Deacon present, being forc'd thereunto in time of Persecution, 'tis needless to tell you, because it has been confirm'd by long Use and Custom: For all those, who lead solitary Lives in Desarts, where no Priests are, keep the Communion in their Houses, and communicate themselves. Besides, in Alexandria and in Egypt, all the People do commonly keep the Communion at home; for when the Priest consecrates the Host, and distributes it, we may reasonably believe, they partake of It, and carry It with them.*

I need not go about to prove, that this Communion was nothing else but the Sacred Bread; for 'tis plain, S. Basil speaks only of that



*The Communion in One Kind.*

that which is touch'd with the Hand. Besides, 'tis certain he cou'd not mean the *Sacred Cup*, when he speaks of the *Communion* in the *Desarts*; it being evident, that the *Species* of Wine could not be preserv'd, for any time, in so small a Quantity, as they must have taken it.

De O-  
bit. Satyr. S. *Ambrose* gives us much such another Account of this *Communion*: He tells us, how his Brother *Satyrus* was miraculously sav'd from Drowning, by the Faith he had in the *Sacred Host*. For being in a Storm, where all were given for lost, he begg'd of one of the *Christians*, who were aboard, to give him a Piece of the *Sacred Bread* which he had; and having, by the Earnestness of his Prayers, obtain'd that Favour, *He wrapp'd this Divine Sacrament* (saith S. *Ambrose*) *in a Cloth, and tyed it about his Neck* (for being a Catechumen only, he wou'd not eat it) *cast himself into the Sea*; and God, to recompense the Greatness of his Faith, brought him safe from that boisterous Element. Here you see the *Christians*, agreeably to what S. *Basil* saith, us'd to carry the *Sacred Bread* about them, that they may eat of It, in case of any Hazard or Danger. But of this enough.

Touching the *Publick and Solemn Communion of the Church*, I own we have no Instances from Fathers or, Ecclesiastical Writers, for the First Four Centuries to prove, that the *Communion* was publickly given, *in One Kind*, to any, except Infants, and Little Children; nor can our Adversaries instance in any, who says it was not so given: And so  
far

far we are upon the Level. But methinks (the Scales being thus even) the Practice and Custom of the Church, expressly recorded and deliver'd by the Writers, and Liturgies of the Fifth, Sixth, and all other succeeding Ages, in favour of the *Publick Communion in One*, as well as in Both Kinds, ought to weigh down the Balance, and determine any reasonable Man to conclude, that this same Practice was deriv'd from the foregoing Ages.

We find indeed, in the Latter End of the Fifth Age, a Decree of *Pope Gelasius*, which forbids certain People to receive the *Communion in One Kind*; but if we attend to the Motives and Circumstances of this Decree, and to the Persons there meant, we shall find, it is so far from destroying our *Hypothesis*, that it plainly confirms it. What gave occasion to it was this: *In the time of S. Leo, Pope Gelasius his Predecessour, there was a great many Manichees in Rome, who, the better to spread their wicked Errours, feign'd themselves Catholicks, and frequented the Churches and Sacraments like others; but it being part of their Belief, that Wine was created by the Devil, and that Jesus Christ did not spill His Blood for us; but that His Passion was Fantastick, not Real, they abhor'd Wine above all things, and therefore abstain'd from the Sacred Cup in the Communion.*

*S. Leo complains of the Disorders, which they caus'd in the Church; he declaims against their Wicked and Hellish Devices; he tells us, they were so bold, as to presume to mix themselves*  
with

with the Faithful, and receive the Lord's Body, but abstain'd from the Sacred Cup; and gives that, as a Mark to discern them by. But because the Faithful were at liberty to take One, or Both Kinds; and that many devout Christians receiv'd the Body, without the Sacred Cup, it was hard to find out by that Mark, who these Manichees were. However, S. Leo did not think fit to alter the Discipline of the Church, nor take away their Liberty from the Faithful; but was content to insinuate, that whosoever should refuse to take the Sacred Cup, as abhorring Wine, or in detestation to the Blood of Christ, shou'd be reputed of that Sect. But this Remedy proving ineffectual, Pope Gelasius was forc'd to decree, that whosoever abstain'd from the Sacred Cup, upon any such superstitious Pretence, shou'd be altogether depriv'd of the Communion. It may not be a-

Gr. Dist.  
2 can. com-  
per. de con-  
secrat.

miss to subjoin his very Words. We have found out, that some People do take only the Body, and abstain from the Sacred Blood, who, seeing they are engag'd in, I know not what Superstition, must either take both Parts, or be depriv'd of both; because the Division of one, and the same Mystery, cannot be done without great Sacrilege.

Now, to give you my Thoughts upon this Decree; I think it is plain.

1. That there was no need of making such a Decree, if all the Catholics, in those Days, had receiv'd the Communion in Both Kinds: For this being made, on purpose, to discover the Manichees, who never drank Wine, there was nothing so easy as to find out who they were, upon their Refusal of the Sacred Cup, consequently there needed no De-

cree



cree to discover them. But since it is confess'd, that these Hereticks did mix themselves with the *Catholicks*, and receiv'd the *Communion only in One Kind*, and that notwithstanding all S. *Leo's* Care and Diligence to find them out, they were still undiscover'd; I think it is a Demonstration, that some *Catholicks*, as well as the *Manichees*, did receive the *Communion in One Kind* only, and this being all that I undertook to evince, I might now take leave of this Decree. But I shall observe.

2. That the Prohibition here made affects only those, who are engag'd in a certain Superstition; *Who, seeing they are engag'd in I know not what Superstition, must either take Both Parts, or be depriv'd of Both*: For the reason why they are to be depriv'd of Both Parts of the Sacrament, unless they take Both, is because they were engag'd in a certain Superstition, which tended to destroy the *Sacrifice of our Redemption*, by the Belief they had, that *Christ's Blood* was only an Illusion, and to divide that Mystery, Which *Gelasius* says, cannot be done without great Sacrilege, by the like wicked Opinion, that Wine being created by the Devil, *Christ* wou'd never have instituted the Memorial of His Passion in that Liquor. Whence 'tis evident, that the *Catholicks*, who were in no manner engag'd in these superstitious Errors, are nothing concern'd in this Decree, nor barr'd of the Liberty, they always had of receiving the Sacrament *in One*, or Both Kinds, as suited best with their Devotion.

N

And

And this is so true, that we find the Practice of it recommended by a Canon of a very Famous, if not General Council, held in *Constantinople* in the VI Century, known to *Can. lii.* the Ancients, by the Name of *Concilium Trullanum*. This Council confirms the ancient Custom of the *Greek Church*, which was to celebrate Mass in *Lent* only on *Saturdays* and *Sundays*; it being by the Ancients judg'd improper to consecrate on any of those Days, on which they fasted; because they wou'd not (as they commonly speak) mix the Solemnity of the Sacrifice with the Sadness of the Fast. But on these Two Days, in which they did not fast, they us'd to consecrate, and reserve as much of the Sacred Oblation, as wou'd suffice for the Clergy and Laity to take every Day, till the *Saturday* following; and this they call'd *The Mass of the Presanctified*, than which nothing is more frequently mention'd in the *Greek Church*.

Now to know what was offer'd, and distributed to the People in this *Mass*: All the ancient *Greek Liturgies*, tell us, that there *Euch.* was nothing reserv'd, but the *Sacred Bread*; *Goar. Bib.* that this Bread was carry'd in Procession, *P. P. Paris,* from the Sacristy into the Church, expos'd *T. II.* to be ador'd by the People, and, after some Ceremony, distributed to all the Faithful. So that here is a *Publick and Solemn Communion* given in *One Kind*, for Five Days every Week yearly, while *Lent* holds. But this Practice was not peculiar to the *Greek*; for we find it as early, and as solemnly us'd in the *Latin Church*. The *Roman Ordinal*, whose

whose Antiquity, I suppose, no body will question, being that, which St. Gregory the Great made use of, in the VI Century, gives us the same Account of Good Friday Service with that, which is express'd in the Rubricks of our present Mass-Book. Alcuinus, a Famous Author of the VIII Century, relates the same thing: So doth Rupertus, Hugo de Sancto Victore, and other Writers of the XI Century. They tell us, that on Good Friday, there was no Consecration made; but that the Body of our Lord, Which was consecrated the Day before, was reserv'd for that Day's Communion; that the Priest took the Lord's Body, and some unconsecrated Wine and Water, and then gave the Communion to the People, under the Form of Bread alone. So that there has been a perpetual Practice in the Latin Church, of giving the Communion, in One Kind solemnly once every Year, both to Clergy and Laity, even to this very time.

Bib. P.  
P. var. T.  
de Div.  
off.

De Div.  
off.

Lib. ii.  
C. ix. De  
Div. off.

I might, further, bring the Authority of Sozomenus, Evagrius, Authors of the VI Century, and of several Great, and Learned Men of the Gallican Church, to confirm this Practice; but I think it is sufficiently evident from what is said, that the Communion was publickly given in One Kind ever since Christians had Churches for Publick and Solemn Service. I shall therefore proceed to shew, in the last place;

That to take the Communion, in both kinds, is not Essential to the Sacrament, from the Consent of our Adversaries, if consistent with themselves.



The Communion in One Kind.

I suppose *Martin Luther's* Opinion in this Matter, is of no small Authority; for 'tis but reasonable to suppose, that those, who have follow'd the Scheme, which he drew, shou'd pay their just Tribute of Respect to his Opinion in this Point. Let us then hear him speak. *If any Council* (says he) *shou'd chance to decree* (the Communion in Both Kinds) *we shou'd by no means make use of Both, nay, we wou'd sooner, in contempt of the Council, take One, or neither, than Both; and curse those, who shou'd, by the Authority of such a Council make use of both Kinds.* Here, I think, it is very plain, *Luther* was of Opinion, that Both Kinds was not essential to the Sacrament; else, surely, he wou'd not have said, *that he wou'd sooner make use of Neither, than of Both; nor curse those, who shou'd take Both Kinds.* But the Discipline of the *French Protestants* will afford us a more ample Testimony in this Matter.

In a Synod held at *Potiers*, Anno 1560. and in another in *Roche*, 1571. It is provided, that those, who cannot drink Wine, may receive the Communion under the Form of Bread. It may not be amiss to subjoin their very Words, as they are read in the xii Chapter of their Discipline. *Tit. Of the Lord's Sup. Art. 7. The Bread of the Lord's Supper ought to be administer'd to those, who cannot drink Wine, upon their making protestation, that it is not out of contempt; and upon their Endeavouring, what they can, to obviate all Scandal, even by approaching the Cup, as near their Mouths, as they are able. Now 'tis not to be imagin'd*

imagin'd, that these Gentlemen shou'd think Both Kinds essential to the *Communion*, and yet make such a Decision: For there is no body, who is never so little read in Philosophy, but knows, that the Essence of things is indivisible; that, by separating one essential Part from the other, you destroy the Nature of the whole; that in giving only an essential Part of a thing, you give nothing in regard of that, whose essential Part it was; consequently he that gives but part of the Sacrament, gives no Sacrament at all: Therefore these Gentlemen, who knew better things, in ordering the Bread alone to be given to those, who cou'd not drink Wine, cannot, in reason, be suppos'd to believe, that the *Cup* was essential to the *Communion*; else they wou'd have absolutely refus'd the Sacrament to those, who cou'd not receive It in Both Kinds; since to give It in *One Kind*, were to give nothing at all, but rather to profane, and abuse That, Which is most Sacred and August in the *Christian Religion*; whereas the natural Disability of those, who cannot drink Wine, might reasonably excuse them from taking either kind. And thus I have endeavour'd, as briefly, as I cou'd, to prove from the Practice and Discipline of the Church in all Ages; from publick, as well as *Private Communion*; from *Liturgies, Fathers and Historians*; and even from the consent of our Adversaries, manifestly imply'd in their Discipline, and Practice; that neither the *Primitive Christians*, nor the *Catholic Church*, in any Age, nor yet any *Ortho-*

*dox Believer* did ever think, that to take the Sacrament in Both Kinds, was essential to the *Communion*. And if so, then it is plain and evident, that the Church hath Power to, and may lawfully, restrain the Faithful from the *Cup*, and confine them to *One Kind* only. Let us now see what *Dr. Tillotson* objects to all this.

And here I shall not abuse the Reader's Patience, by repeating the same thing over again; for, since all that can, with any Colour of Reason, be objected, is contain'd in one short Paragraph (tho' the things there insisted on are often repeated in several of his Sermons, but with no material Addition) I will only transcribe it, and offer my Exceptions to it.

“ And then (says he) the *Communion*, in  
 “ *One Kind*, is plainly contrary to our Savi-  
 “ our's Institution in Both Kinds, as they  
 “ themselves acknowledge. And therefore  
 “ the *Council of Constance* being sensible of  
 “ this, was forc'd to decree it with an ex-  
 “ press *Non obstante* to the Institution of  
 “ *Christ*, and the Practice of the Apostles,  
 “ and the Primitive Church. And their Do-  
 “ctrine of Concomitancy (as if the Blood  
 “ were in the Flesh, and together with it)  
 “ will not help the Matter; because, in the  
 “ *Sacrament Christ's Body* is represented as  
 “ broken, and pierc'd, and exhausted, and  
 “ drain'd of His Blood; and His Blood is  
 “ represented as shed and poured out; so  
 “ that *One Kind* can by no means contain  
 “ and exhibit Both.



Three things the Dr. here insists upon. 1. *That we our selves acknowledge the Communion in One Kind to be contrary to our Saviour's Institution.* 2. *That the Council of Constance was forc'd to decree it with a Non Obstante to the Institution of Christ.* 3. *That the Doctrine of Concomitancy will not help the Matter; because, in the Sacrament, Christ's Body is represented as broken, and exhausted, and drain'd of His Blood.*

I may say, of these Three Propositions, the First is neither True, nor to the Purpose. The Second is something to the Purpose, but not true. The Third is like the First, neither true, nor to the Purpose. I begin with the First:

“ We our selves acknowledge, that the  
“ *Communion in One Kind* is contrary to our  
“ *Saviour's Institution.* For my own part, I have read, at least, some of the best *R. Catholick Casuists* and *Divines*, upon this Subject, and have convers'd with many more. Yet I declare, I never read, nor heard any of them say, that to give the *Communion in One Kind*, was contrary to our *Saviour's Institution*; nay, I think, all *R. Catholicks* do believe, that the Administration of the *Communion*, whether in *One*, or *Both Kinds*, is quite another thing from the Institution of it. We say, indeed, that when *Christ* instituted the *Sacrifice of His Body and Blood*, He consecrated not in *One*, but in *Both Kinds*; because He design'd to leave these Symbols to His Church, as a perpetual and everlasting Memorial of his Body broken, and Blood

*The Communion in One Kind.*

shed upon the Cross, which is express'd by the Separation of one Symbol from t'other; and this, I hope, we are careful to do, as often as we offer that Sacrifice: But to eat or partake of the Sacrifice it self, *in One*, or Both Kinds, is sure, no Part of the Institution, but belongs to the *Modus*, or *Manner* of administering it.

*Christ* instituted the Sacraments of *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, and *Matrimony*; yet we do not find, that ever He gave, or administer'd any of these Sacraments to any body; which surely, He wou'd not have omitted, were it any part of their Institution: 'Tis then plain, that to give the *Communion in One*, or Both Kinds, is neither for, nor against our *Saviour's* Institution, but respects merely Administration and Use. But let us suppose with the Dr. that to administer the *Communion in One Kind*, is contrary (I do not say to *Christ's* Institution, for that it cannot be, but) to the Manner in which our *Saviour* gave it; yet still I do not see how this can help the Matter: For the Question is not whether *Christ* gave It in Both Kinds, but whether we ought necessarily to give It in Both Kinds, because He did so? This the Dr. affirms, and we deny. But how does he prove it? Why, because *Christ* gave It in Both Kinds. This is begging the Question. Well, because *Christ* gave It in Both Kinds, we ought to do so too: This is to say (if it be to the purpose) that we are bound to do all those things that *Christ* did, at the Institution and Administration of the Com-

*munion*

*munion*. If so, then we must fall to wash the Disciples Feet, to eat Suppers before the *Sacrament*, to administer the *Communion* at Night; and (which is more strange) we must command all those to whom we give the *Communion*, to do the same thing we do, that is, *To consecrate and administer the Sacrament*, and consequently make them all Priests; all these things, I say, we are bound to do: For *Christ* did all, and every Particular here mention'd to all those, to whom He gave the *Communion* in Both Kinds. But since neither he, nor any Man in his Wits will say, that we are bound to do all these things; because the Discipline and Practice of the Church, and the Living Members of it have determin'd that all those Particulars are now neither necessary, nor expedient, I hope he will give us leave to conclude, that we are not bound, to give the *Communion* in Both Kinds neither.

Touching the Second Proposition, " The *Council of Constance* was forc'd to decree " it with a *Non Obstante* to the Institution " of *Christ*.

The Dr. is not the only Man, who affirms this; for I find it in the Works of one, or two more of his Brethren, upon this Subject. But Good God! What may not Men undertake, who have the confidence to give out such Calumnies for Truth? 'Tis a vulgar Observation, but a true one, that when Mountebanks pretend most to Infallible Cures, they are then furthest from them; just so 'tis with these Gentlemen (for there are



are Mountebanks in Religion as well as in Physick) when they pretend most to Evidence and Demonstration, in Matters of Religion, then they have the least Colour, or reasonable Pretence to it. But the best way to refute this Calumny, is to cite the very Words of the Council; and then let the Reader judge what Faith is to be given to Men, who vend such Impostures for Truth.

\* In No-  
mine San-  
ctæ & In-  
dividuæ  
Trinitatis,  
Patris, &  
Filij, &  
Spiritus  
Sancti, A-  
men-- Li-  
cet Christus  
post Cœ-  
nam insti-  
tuerit &  
Suis Dis-  
cipulis ad-  
ministra-  
verit, sub  
utraque  
Specie Pa-  
nis & Vi-  
ni, hoc  
Venerabi-  
le Sacra-  
mentum;  
tamen hoc  
non ob-

stante, Sacrorum Canonum Authoritas, laudabilis & approbata Ec-  
clesiæ Consuetudo servavit & servat, quod hujusmodi Sacramen-  
tum non debet confici post Cœnam, neque a Fidelibus recipi non  
jejunis, nisi in casu Infirmittatis aut alterius Necessitatis, a Jure vel  
ab Ecclesia, concessio vel admissio.

\* " In the Name of the Holy and Undi-  
vided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,  
Amen— Tho' Christ hath instituted this  
Venerable Sacrament after Supper, and  
hath administer'd It to His Disciples un-  
der Both Kinds of Bread and Wine; Ta-  
men hoc non obstante, yet this notwithstanding,  
the Authority of the Sacred Canons, the  
laudable and approv'd Custom of the  
Church, hath held, and doth hold, that  
this Sacrament ought not to be made after  
Supper, nor receiv'd by the Faithful not  
fasting; except in case of Infirmity, or  
some other Necessity, approv'd and al-  
low'd by Law, or by the Church.

This is all, in this Decree, that has any  
relation to the Doctor's *Non Obstante*. And  
now, I appeal to the most partial of our Ad-  
versaries, whether he had the least Colour,  
or Pretence to what he here suggests? There

is, i  
this  
to  
and  
to t  
and  
the  
the  
the  
such  
A  
" E  
" M  
" E  
" H  
the  
rep  
ces,  
Blo  
his  
of t  
pos  
thin  
Tha  
His  
ent  
dily  
sted  
hav  
mea  
dra  
We  
turi  
list  
For

is, indeed, a *Non Obstante* to the making of this Sacrament after Supper, and giving It to those, who were not fasting, and no more, and if this be a Sin, sure, he is not qualified to throw the First Stone at us for it: For he, and his Brethren, are confessedly involv'd in the same Crime, seeing they do not make the *Sacrament* after Supper, nor give It (to the best of their Knowledge) to any but such as are fasting.

As to the Third Proposition: " The Doctrine of *Concomitancy* will not help the Matter; because in the *Sacrament*, *Christ's* Body is represented as Broken and Exhausted, and Drain'd of His Blood. Hence the Dr. infers, that the *Sacred Bread*, Which represents His Body under these Circumstances, cannot be said to contain, or exhibit His Blood. But methinks he shou'd have prov'd his *Postulatum*, before he wou'd persuade us of the Truth of this Inference: For, I suppose, he was too well acquainted with us, to think we shou'd believe it, upon his Word. That our Blessed Lord shed a great deal of His Precious Blood, as much as was sufficient for the Redemption of Mankind, we readily grant; but that His Body was Exhausted, and Drain'd of His Blood, so as to have none at all left in It, we can by no means assent to. If *Christ's* Body had been drain'd of his Blood, He wou'd have died of Weakness and Loss of Blood; but the Centurion, who it seems, was a better Naturalist than the Dr. thought quite otherwise: For he concluded from the Force and Vigour,

*The Communion in One Kind.*

gour, wherewith our Blessed Lord gave up the Ghost, that He was the *Son of God*; *Verè Filius Dei erat Iste*. Nor will it avail the Dr. that, when the Soldier pierc'd His Side with a Spear, there came out Blood and Water: For *Christ* being then Dead, and the Blood, as Anatomists, and Experience teach us, being by the last Motion of the Heart, convey'd from the Arteries into the Veins, where it stands still, when there is no more Circulation, it is impossible to conceive, how all the Blood in His Body shou'd come out of His Side, especially in the Posture He then lay in: So that that, which the Dr. wou'd have us take for granted, has no Degree of Truth in it. Well, but suppose we shou'd grant, that *Christ's* Body was exhausted, and drain'd of His Blood; will this destroy the Doctrine of Concomitancy? By no means: For since we believe, that under the *Species* of Bread, is really, or (as his own Catechism says) *verily and indeed*, contain'd the Body of *Christ*, Which (being now a Humane Living Body) must necessarily have Blood in It, tho' we shou'd suppose It had none when It was Dead; we have all the reason in the World to believe, that when we take the *Lord's Body*, we do, at the same time, by Concomitancy, that is, *Together with It*, take the Blood which It contains. So that, tho' it were true, that the Body of *Christ* was exhausted, and drain'd of His Blood, in His Passion, yet it would not at all prejudice our Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, nor make any thing for the Doctor's Purpose.

But



But, you will say: *If the Communion, in One Kind, be Sufficient; if It contains the Body and Blood of Christ; why did the Christians heretofore sometimes receive It in Both Kinds?* I answer, *Because the Representation of the Death of our Lord is more fully express'd in Both Kinds, than in One.* But then we must consider, that this Representation is not of that Importance, as to balance all the weighty Considerations, that mov'd the Church to command the Use only of *One Kind*. We have the Death of our Lord sufficiently represented to us, when we take the *Communion in One Kind*, because we believe, and are put in mind, that It is the Flesh and Blood of our Lord, which we receive in remembrance of His Death and *Passion*; and we have this Representation fully express'd in the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, where His Body and Blood are shewn mystically separated under different Forms; and that, almost, as often as we receive the *Communion*. So that there is nothing wanting in our *Communion* to give us a lively Representation of the Death and *Passion* of our Blessed Lord; and if there were, 'tis not of that Moment, as to make amends for the horrid Profanations and Abuses, which must inevitably attend the *Communion* in Both Kinds, in a degenerate Age, in which all Piety and Godliness are almost extinguish'd, and whereof we have sad Instances in our Adversaries Practice, it being frequently boasted by many of their Libertines, that after hard drinking over Night, they come in the Morning to receive the *Communion*,

nion, and drink off whole *Communion Cups* of Consecrated Wine, to quench their Brutish Thirst. Besides the Manner of administering the Sacrament of *Baptism* at present, which our Adversaries do also follow and practise, tho' very different from that of the Primitive Church, doth sufficiently justifie our Conduct in this Particular.

'Tis certain, that the *Regeneration* of the Faithful is more lively express'd, and represented by Immersion, or Plunging into the Water, as the Primitive Church did always Baptise, than by Infusion or Aspersion as we now do: For the Faithful, being plung'd into the *Water of Baptism*, is (as *S. Paul* saith) *Rom. vi.* Bury'd with Christ; and in rising out of it, he seems to rise out of the Tomb with his *Saviour*; and therefore fully represents that Mystery by which he was regenerated; whereas a simple Infusion or Aspersion, such as we use, doth scarce shadow it. Moreover, when the Faithful is immers'd, or dipp'd into the Water, or Font, where all the Parts of the Body are wash'd, this Lotion does more fully express the Cleansing of the Soul from all its Sins, than if One Part only had been wash'd; yet no body doubts, but that the *Baptism* conferr'd by Infusion, or sprinkling of Water upon One Part only of the Body, is sufficient to all the Intents and Purposes of the Sacrament, because the main thing is there represented, namely, *The Washing of the Soul*. So that it is enough to express the Mystery as to the Substance, and the Effect, and the Grace, that is annex'd

nex'd to it, and not scrupulously to inquire after every minute Circumstance of it, especially when there are weighty Reasons and Motives, to dissuade us from it.

In like manner, tho' we do not so fully represent the Death of our Lord, when we take the *Communion in One Kind*, as we shou'd by taking it in Both; yet we are perswaded, that there is nothing (essential to the Sacrament) wanting to it; because we do both expresse and receive the Substance, the Effect, and the Grace of the Sacrament, that is, *The Body and Blood of Christ*, the Spiritual Food of our Souls, and that strict Union with *Christ*, which (as He Himself saith) maketh *us dwell in Him, and Him in us*. And if the Church did forbid the Laity the Use of the *Sacred Cup*, 'twas not with an Intent to rob them of any thing, that might tend to increase their Devotion, as our Adversaries do most unjustly suggest; but in respect to the *Precious Blood of Christ*, for Which, surely, we cannot have too much Veneration. She saw, that, as the Piety and Devotion of the People diminish'd, so their Negligence to receive the *Sacred Cup*, in such a Manner as may secure it from spilling, abounded. She found by Experience, that many Infirm and Old, and even Folks in perfect Health, what with coughing, or other Convulsions, as they receiv'd the *Sacred Cup*, gave up their Stomachs into the Chalice, or shed the *Precious Blood*, to the great Horrour of the Spectators, and their own greater Confusion; that others, what with trembling and quaking,



king, did very often, notwithstanding all their Care, spill some Drops of the Sacred *Blood*; in fine, that in Cities, where some Thousands use to communicate at a time, Crouds of People pressing upon the Priest, have sometimes spilt the Sacred Chalice in his Hands; and (which I cannot mention without Horrour) trod upon that Precious *Blood*, by Which they were redeem'd. These and the like Considerations mov'd the Church, or rather the People (for the Church did only confirm the Custom, which was introduc'd for many Years before) to abstain from the Sacred *Cup*; and to content themselves with the Body and Blood of *Christ*, under the Form of Bread, Which is easily receiv'd with due Respect, and without Danger, and to which nothing is wanting, only a more full Representation of the Mystery, which yet is supply'd by other Means, and which (in the Opinion of any reasonable Man) is not sufficient to atone for the afore-said Profanations.

---

#### CHAP. VI.

##### *Of Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.*

**I** May reasonably presume it will not be expected, I shou'd speak much to this Head for the Scandal which our Adversaries wou'd here fasten upon us, is so gross and palpable, that it were to abuse the Reader's Patience to insist long upon our Vindication. They say, we pray in an *Unknown Tongue*; and we say, and are ready to prove, that we pray in the Tongue the best known in Europe.

Europe. And we further say, that therefore we pray in it, because it is so. And I am sure, they themselves (whatever they may say in the Heat of Disputes) are, upon all other Occasions, ready to acknowledge this Truth. However, because we are commanded by S. Peter to be ready always to give *i Pet. iii.*  
*an answer to every Man, that asketh us a Reason of the Hope that is in us:* I shall endeavour to offer some of the Reasons why we pray in that Tongue which they call *Unknown*; and leave the Reader to judge, whether our Adversaries have all the reason, they pretend, to cry so loud.

1. We make use of the *Latin Tongue* in our Liturgy, because we would not recede from the Example and Practice of our Ancestours, who, from the First Planting of *Christianity* to this Day, whether in *Rome*, or in any other Part of the Western Church, us'd no other Language in the Liturgy, than *Latin*. And thus to follow the Model, our Holy and Pious Forefathers left us, the *Scripture* not only warrants, but commands us to do: *Remember the Days of Old; consider Deut.*  
*the Years of many Generations: Ask thy Father, xxxii. 7.*  
*and he will shew thee; thy Elders, and they will tell thee.* 'Tis certain, and even acknowledg'd by our Adversaries, that when the *Christian Religion* was first preach'd in the West, every Country had then, as well as now, its own peculiar Language different from the *Latin*; which (tho it was cultivated by Men of Letters and Business, in all Countries to which the *Romans* extended their Conquest,  
 O yet)

yet) the Common People, or Natives, were generally ignorant of: And 'tis no less evident, that the Apostles and Apostolical Men, who preach'd, and propagated the *Christian Religion* in these Countries, were indued with a Power of working Miracles in confirmation of the Truth of it; and by their Readiness to lay down their Lives, and to shed their Blood for it, gave sufficient Testimony of their Zeal and Charity for the Common People, as well as for the Great Ones; yet all the Records of Antiquity, all the Ancient and Modern Liturgies, together with the universal Tradition of the Western Church, and even the Consent of our Adversaries; all these, I say, bear witness, that neither the Apostles, nor the Apostolical Men, who first planted the *Christian Faith* in these Parts, nor any succeeding Generation of *Catholicks*, did ever use in the Publick Liturgy of the Church, any other Language than the *Latin*, which, 'tis confess'd, the Common People generally speaking of all Countries (except *Italy*) are, and have always been ignorant of. And therefore, I think we may very safely tread in the Steps of these our Holy Ancestours, and be content with the Liturgy and Language they left us; at least, if we must be condemn'd for so doing, we have the comfort to be condemn'd in company with these Great and Holy Men, to whose Doctrine and Practice, God Himself was pleas'd to put His Seal.



2. We make use of this Language, because we conceive it very necessary to have an Uniformity, as much as is possible, both in Faith and Practice, that we may with one Heart, and one Tongue, praise the Lord, and magnifie His Holy Name.

The *Catholick Church* is One in Communion, as well as in Faith. Now, how much One common Tongue, in which the Publick Service of the Church is perform'd, contributes to foment this Union, the miserable Distractions and Divisions of our Modern Reformers, who have as many different Religions, as they have different Tongues, do but too manifestly evince. All the *Members of the Catholick Religion* ought to have communion, and fellowship one with another: They shou'd all be united in One common Faith, and One uniform Worship of One God; they ought all to be qualify'd for the Participation of the same Sacrament, and to assist together at the same Publick Divine Service wherever they meet, else how can the Unity of their Faith and Communion subsist? Now, 'tis hard, to conceive, how all this can be perform'd, if we have our Liturgy in as many different Tongues, as there are Countries in the *Catholick Church*: For how can I have fellowship with a Man whose Language I do not understand? How can I join in Prayer, or in God's Publick Worship with any Society of People, when I cannot discern by any thing they do or say, whether they are *Catholicks*, or *Hereticks*? Or how shall I receive the *Sacrament* in the So-

ciety of those, who, for any thing I can see or understand, may be *Jews*, or Blasphemers of my Holy Religion? So that if we take away that common Band, that common Language, that unites, and cements all the *Members of Christ's Mystical Body*, the whole Frame of the *Catholick Church* will dissolve and fall to pieces; and we shall have as many different Churches, as we have Tongues.

3. We do not see what great Loss the Common People suffer by not having the Liturgy in Vulgar Tongues; and if we had, we are sure the Good, that might accrue to them by having it so, is not so valuable as to be purchas'd at the expence of the common Union, and Peace of the whole *Catholick Church*, which, as Experience shews, is necessarily consequent upon such an Indulgence. The most part of the Common People are taught, at least, to read in their own Language; and if we except some of the *Commonality of Ireland*, and the *Highlands of Scotland*, who are industriously barr'd all sort of Education, there is not One in a Hundred, even of the meanest of the Common Sort, who want this Help. And then they have the whole *Mass*, the Epistles, and Gospels, and Collects of all the *Sundays* in the Year, together with all the Psalms in Vulgar Languages, in their Prayer-books, which they may read to themselves in their own Tongue, whilst the Priest reads them, in *Latin*; and which no doubt, contributes more to their Edification, than if the Priest had spoke in their own Tongue, considering, that in *Catholick*

*tholick Countries*, where some Thousands are assembled, it is not possible for the Hundredth part of the Audience to hear what is said, in whatever Language he speaks. Add, that the greatest part of the *Mass* is pronounc'd so low, that scarce any, that is present, hears what is said; the Rubrick so commanding, that the Priest may, in the Silence of Recollection and Meditation be the better dispos'd to perform the Office in that August and Adorable Mystery, with the Gravity and Decency that becomes it. Besides, on all *Sundays*, and great Festivals throughout the Year, there are, in *Catholick Countries*, publick Sermons and Exhortations perform'd in Vulgar Language, yea, and publick Prayers read in the Pulpit, either before, or after the Sermon, in which the People are instructed in their Duty to God and their Neighbours, and excited to do Works of Charity, to forgive their Enemies, and to repent of their Sins; to pray for the King and his Magistrates, and for one another: In a word, in which all the Duties and Obligations of a *Christian* are duely inculcated; and all this, I am sure, they are, at least, in the Countries where I have been, as careful to perform, as they are to say the *Mass*. So that (notwithstanding what *Protestants* say) all the Difference between them and us, in this Particular, is, that we do in Vulgar Language very near all, that they do, and over and above, give the People an Opportunity of adoring *Jesus Christ*, and of quickening their Memory by the Representa-



tation of His Death and *Passion*, which is perform'd in the *Latin Mass*.

*Lastly* (if there were no other Reasons) the Difficulty of translating the Liturgy into Vulgar Languages, and preserving it, in its Purity, is enough to dissuade us from the Undertaking: The Uniformity of our Liturgy is the best standing Monument we have of the Faith and Practice of our Ancestours: 'Tis it that shews us, how they us'd to administer the Sacraments, and what sorts of Ceremonies they judg'd most proper to excite, and stir up Devotion, and to perform God's Service with that Gravity and Decency suitable to His Holy Religion. Now, if this Liturgy were translated into all the Vulgar Languages, which *Catholicks* use, and which is so much subject to Alteration and Corruption, even to that degree, that what is spoken in one Age, is scarce understood in another, at least, is so nauseous and grating, that none but the meaner sort of People will hear it without Disgust: What endless Labour wou'd it prove to be thus every Age modelling, and reforming, and changing our Liturgies? What Confusion and Disorders wou'd the Unskilfulness, or the Fancy of Translators occasion? Nay, what Tumults and Uproars wou'd such frequent Alterations create both in Church and State, whilst some (to use K. *Henry VIII.* his Phrase) stood up for their Old *Mumpsimus*, and others for their New *Sumpsimus*, is not easily imagin'd. And, whatever our Adversaries may think on't, Experience shews us, that

that this is no imaginary, but a real and almost insuperable Difficulty. For instance:

The *Calvinists*, in *France*, made use of *Marrot's* Translation of the *Psalms*, and sung them in their *Temples* (as the *French* call them) for a considerable time; but some of their Learned Ministers, finding that this Translation was not agreeable to the Original, nor even to Decency and Good Behaviour; but, on the contrary, was full of ridiculous, lewd and profane Expressions, resolv'd to give the People a better, and more perfect Translation. Now what Confusions and Divisions this Last created among the Brethren, whoever is curious to know, may consult the Writers of those Times. Again, the *Church of England*, which, without doubt, is the best (because the least reform'd) of the *Protestant Party*, translated the *Scripture*, compos'd a New Ordinal, and a Set Form of Prayer in Vulgar Language, in *Edward the Sixth's* Time; but these being found in *Q. Elizabeth* and *K. James's* Days (if we believe their own Writers) deficient in many things, and in others not agreeable to the then *Protestant Religion*, which was not, as yet, perfectly lick'd into Shape and Form, other New Translations are undertaken; but how much Confusion and Trouble these also occasion'd, the said Writers can best inform us. Further, the *Church of England* is the richest, and (if we may judge by their Works) the most charitable of all the *Reformation*; yet there pass'd 100 Years of the Reign of *Protestantism* before the *Welch* were provided of

a Liturgy in their own Language, though most of the Common People of that Country do not understand any other Tongue. And to this Day, they have not furnish'd the *Irish* with a Liturgy in their own Language, tho' many Thousands in the *North of Ireland*, and in the *Highlands of Scotland*, go to Church, which yet understand nothing but the *Irish Tongue*. So that it is no such easy Matter to furnish even the Subjects of One Crown with Liturgies in their own Language. Now, if it be so difficult to supply a few People with Liturgies in their own Tongue, and so hard to contain them in their Duty, when the said Liturgies must be alter'd; who can imagine all the Difficulties that wou'd attend the Attempt, shou'd the *Cath. Church* propose to translate her Liturgy into all the several Languages us'd in *Europe*? Or who can conceive, how it were possible for her to keep an Uniformity in Practice and Ceremony, or to contain the People in their Duty, if she must change her Liturgy every Hundred Years or less, and speak a New Language.

The Gentry, and Better sort of People cannot abide to have their Ears grated with obsolete, antick Expressions; and the Common People, who think the Substance chang'd with the Words, will not part with their *Old Mumpsimus*. And then, what fine work wou'd this make! *Marot*, in one of his Psalms, gives us this ridiculous Phrase; *I will cast my Slipper at him*. The Common People, who minded only the Rhime and Gingle of  
the



the Words, no sooner understood, that this Phrase was alter'd, tho' indeed for the better, when they were so incens'd upon the Matter, that the Ministers were like to have (not Slippers but) Sticks, and Stones, and such Arms, as a Popular Fury administer'd, cast at them. And what, do you think, shou'd happen in the *Church of Rome*, where there are so many different Languages; so many different Humours, so hard to be satisfied; so many uncouth, unpolish'd People, so difficult to be govern'd; shou'd she undertake to give them the Liturgy in their own Tongues, and continue changing and altering the same, as often as the Languages change. Truly for my part, as I am persuaded, that the Design is as vain, as it is needless, so I may reasonably presume, the *Holy Catholick Church* will never attempt it. And thus I have endeavour'd to touch upon some of the Reasons, that mov'd the Church in all Ages, to hold to One Universal Language, which is always the same, not subject to Alteration or Corruption, no more than the Faith and Religion which it teacheth; nor less pure and perfect now, than it was 1700 Years since. And surely, such a Language so Lofty in its Expressions; so Beautiful and Majestick in its Numbers; so Energick and Expressive in its Sense; and, as I may say, so Immortal and Indefectible, in its Duration; is the fittest to have the Publick, and Solemn Service of the Immortal and Eternal God perform'd in it. And in this, methinks, we do but what the Light of Nature teacheth

eth all Nations, and what our Adversaries cou'd not but see, wou'd they but divest themselves of their Prejudices.

'Tis well known, the *Jews* lost this Mother Tongue in the *Captivity of Babylon*; yet they never read the *Law of Moses*, or the *Psalms*, in their Publick Prayers, from that Time to this, in any other Language than the *Hebrew*, tho' (if we except their Rabbins) very few, if any of that Nation understand any thing of it.

See Father Symon's Critical History of the Old and New Testament.

The *Grecians* have long since corrupted their Language, as all the World knows; and the Common People among them know no more of the genuine *Greek*, than ours do of the *Latin*; yet the *Greek Church* never chang'd a Syllable in their Liturgy; but do still say their *Mass* in the same pure *Greek*, which was us'd when they first embrac'd the *Christian Faith*. All other Sects of *Christians*, in the Eastern Churches, have likewise corrupted their Languages; yet, they continue to celebrate Divine Service in the Languages they first us'd, tho' the Common People do not understand them. And (if I may be allow'd to borrow an Instance from Infidels) the *Turks* still retain the *Arabick Language* in their *Alcoran*; nor did they ever permit it to be read in any other Tongue, in their Publick Prayers, tho' 'tis confess'd their Common People understand it not. But of this enough. Let us now see what the Dr. objects to this Point.

And here I do not intend to pursue him in all the Repetitions he makes of the same thing

thing, without any material Addition; for then I shou'd transcribe several, almost entire Sermons; but shall for the Reader's Ease, and my own, bring all his real, or apparent Difficulties, within the Compass of these few Heads.

*First*, He saith, " That the Celebrating of  
" Divine Service *in an Unknown Tongue* is  
" contrary to the Practice of the Primitive  
" Church, and the great Design, and End  
" of Religious Worship, which (being a rea-  
" sonable Service) ought to be directed by  
" our Understanding, and accompany'd  
" with our Hearts and Affections.

*2dly*, " That to pray *in an Unknown Tongue*  
" is contrary to *S. Paul's* Doctrine, who has  
" no less than a Whole Chapter wherein he  
" confutes and condemns this Practice.

*3dly*, " That we lock up the *Scriptures* in  
" *an Unknown Tongue*, and forbid the People  
" the Use of them; which is contrary to  
" *Christ's* own Design, Who exhorts the  
" *Jews* to search the *Scriptures*; to *St. Luke*,  
" who commends the *Bereans* for examining  
" the *Scriptures*, and trying the Apostles  
" Doctrine by that Test; and to the Ancient  
" Fathers, who do most earnestly recom-  
" mend to the People the Reading and Stu-  
" dy of the *Scriptures*.

Vol. I.  
edit. post  
Obit. Pag  
126. 161.

*4thly*, " That the *Scripture* being, by our  
" own Confession, a principal Part of the  
" Rule of Faith, it cannot be imagin'd,  
" how People shou'd square, or measure  
" their Faith by this Rule, unless they are  
" allow'd to read and understand it.

Vol. I.  
edit. post  
Obit. Pag  
264.

*Lastly*,



Vol. II.  
edit. post  
Obit. Pag.  
363.

Lastly, " That we therefore lock up the  
" *Scriptures in an Unknown Tongue*, because it  
" is certain, that if the People were once  
" brought to understand the *Scriptures*, they  
" wou'd soon quit our Religion, and go o-  
" ver to them. This is the Sum of what he  
says upon this Subject, to which I shall re-  
turn my Exceptions as plainly, and briefly  
as I can.

1. He saith, " That the Celebrating of Di-  
" vine Service in an *Unknown Tongue* is con-  
" trary to the Practice of the Primitive  
" Church. I answer, If he means, by *Un-  
known Tongue*, such a Tongue as no body un-  
derstands, it is very true, but not to the  
Purpose: For the Tongue, in which we ce-  
lebrate Divine Service, is not such, but, on  
the contrary, the Tongue in the World, I  
believe, the best known. But if he means by  
it, a *Tongue Unknown* to most of the Common  
People, his Assertion has no Degree of Truth  
in it: For, first he himself acknowledges, and  
so doth all Mankind, that the Primitive  
Church, and all succeeding Generations (I  
mean in the *Latin Church*) till the *Reforma-  
tion* appear'd, did celebrate Divine Service  
in the same *Latin Tongue* we now use. And  
2dly, even Malice it self cannot deny but  
that, generally speaking, all the Common  
People (except the *Italians*) were always ig-  
norant of the *Latin Tongue*. 'Tis then mani-  
fest, our Conduct in this Particular is alto-  
gether conformable to the Practice of the Pri-  
mitive Church; and then the Dr. is out in  
his First Attempt. This he cou'd not but see,  
and

and therefore in another Place he endeavours to insinuate (tho' he durst not speak it out) that the Common People spoke all *Latin*. But this only shews what the Wit of Man is capable of, when we must, and will maintain a thing. What, the *Common People of Spain, France, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, England, Ireland, Scotland, &c.* spoke all *Latin!* 'Tis indeed confess'd, all these People were in communion with the *Church of Rome*; all receiv'd their Faith and Liturgy from her; all celebrated Divine Service in the same Tongue, and after the same Manner with her; but that they all spoke and understood the *Roman, or Latin Tongue*, is surely so ridiculously absurd, that I rather believe, I mistook his Meaning, than that a Man of his Parts shou'd be guilty of so great a Mistake.

As to what he says, That *Religious Worship (being a reasonable Service) ought to be directed by our Understanding, and accompany'd with our Hearts and Affections*, I readily agree with him: And for that reason, I hope, we are as careful to teach the Common People their Prayers in their own Tongue, and to exhort them to say them in the same Tongue, as our Neighbours: Yet this notwithstanding, it did not seem good to the *Holy Spirit of God*, Who guides His Church into all Truth, and consequently into all good Practices, to alter that Tongue, which venerable Antiquity, and a Prescription of now almost 1700 Years, have consecrated to His Divine Worship. The Reasons whereof I have partly touch'd upon before.

Touching

Touching the Second, viz. "That to  
 "pray in an *Unknown Tongue* is contrary to  
 "St. Paul's Doctrine, who has no less than  
 "a Whole Chapter wherein he confutes  
 "and condemns this Practice.

*Ans.* The Chapter the Dr. here refers to  
 to, is the xiv. of the First to the *Corinthians*,  
 which, had it been faithfully translated ei-  
 ther from their own *Greek*, or our *Latin*,  
 wou'd leave no room for this Objection.  
 The Question is, *Whether St. Paul condemns*  
*Publick Prayers in a Tongue, which all the Com-*  
*mon People do not understand?* This the Dr. af-  
 firms, and vouches the Authority of the *En-*  
*glish Translation* in the aforesaid Chapter,  
 where S. Paul, as he says, condemns *Prayers*  
*in an Unknown Tongue*. We say, First, S. Paul  
*has no such thing as Unknown Tongue; but*  
*the Word Unknown, is an Addition of their*  
*own.* 2dly, *St. Paul does not condemn Speaking*  
*or Praying with Tongues, which is the only*  
*thing there mention'd.* And both these we are  
 able to make appear; the First, from their  
 own Translation, in which (tho' they give it  
 to us in their Sermons and Disputes for cur-  
 rent *Scripture*, yet, they put the Word *Un-*  
*known* in small *Italick* Characters, to distin-  
 guish it from what is truly *Scripture*. The Se-  
 cond, from St. Paul's own Words, in the  
 same Place, where he says, *I wou'd that ye all*  
*spake with Tongues*, Ver. 5. But sure he wou'd  
 not condemn that in them which he wou'd  
 have them to do.

But to take away all Doubt, I shall tran-  
 scribe those Words of S. Paul from the Ori-  
 ginal,



ginal, on which the Dr. lays all the stress, and examine the whole Scope and Design of this Chapter; and then let even Malice itself judge, whether he has any Grounds for this Objection. Saint Paul's Words are thus; ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ, *He that speaketh with a Tongue.* Thus the English Translation renders, *He that speaketh in an Unknown Tongue.* The Latin Vulgat, agreeable to the Greek; *Qui enim Lingua loquitur, non Homini- bus sed Deo loquitur.* Again: Διοτις ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ, *Wherefore he that speaketh with a Tongue.* The English Version says, *Wherefore he that speaketh in an Unknown Tongue.* Further; εἰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, *For if I pray with a Tongue.* In the English Version 'tis, *For if I pray in an Unknown Tongue.* And thus 'tis render'd Four or Five times more, as often as St. Paul seems to speak against this Practice (tho' 'tis evident from the Tenor of the whole Chapter he does not speak against it, but prefers Prophefying to it) but where he seems to favour it, they alter their Style, leave out the Word *Unknown*, and render S. Paul's Words as I do, tho' S. Paul uses the self same Terms in both Places. For instance, Θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις. This they render, *I wou'd that ye all spake with Tongues.* I wonder they did not render it thus; *I wou'd that ye speak with Unknown Tongues!* Ay, but that will take away all the Force of the Objection! Again; Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μὲν, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν. This they render, *I thank my God I speak with Tongues more than you all.* In these Two Verses where praying or speaking

Ver. 2.

Ver. 13.

Ver. 14.

with

*with Tongues* is commended, the same Word is interpreted, *With Tongues*, which in the former Verses must signifie *Unknown Tongue*. And thus *St. Paul* is made to speak what these Gentlemen please. When the Word *Unknown* seems to make for them, it must be inserted; but when it is against them it must be left out. Well, but what are these Tongues whereof *S. Paul* here speaks? And why does he hold forth to the *Corinthians* so long upon this Argument.

I answer. 1. *St. Paul* here speaks of those extraordinary and surprising Tongues wherewith the First Believers were inspir'd, by the *Holy Ghost*, which was pour'd down upon them, as appears from several Places in the *Acts of the Apostles*, where 'tis said, *The Holy Ghost fell upon them—and they spake with Tongues*. 2dly, *S. Paul* holds forth to the *Corinthians* so long upon this Argument, in order to give some Cautions concerning these Tongues. He knew, that such extraordinary Tongues were intended rather as a Sign to the Unbelievers, than for the Instruction of the Faithful. He foresaw, the said Tongues wou'd occasion a great deal of Confusion and Disorder among the *Christians*, if all those, who were inspir'd with them, were allow'd to rise up, and speak all at once; and that the Progress of the *Gospel* wou'd be very much retarded, if such Proceedings were not moderated. Therefore he instructs the *Corinthians* in what they were to do upon this Occasion: He tells them, that though he wou'd have them all speak *with Tongues*,

Tongues, yet that he had rather they shou'd prophesy; and upon this Argument he takes up more than half the Chapter, to inforce the Necessity of prophesying more than of speaking *with Tongues*. But that if they wou'd speak *with Tongues*, he desires it shou'd be done *by Two, or at most by Three, and that by course*. And now let even the most partial of our Adversaries judge, whether there be any thing in all this, which doth, in the least, insinuate, that S. Paul condemns praying, or speaking *with Tongues*; nay, doth not he positively say, *that he wou'd have them all speak with Tongues*; or whether these surprising Tongues, which were the Effects of the Impulse of the *Holy Ghost*, and which many Hundred Years since have ceas'd, are any way applicable to our present *Latin*, than which no Tongue on *Earth* is better or more universally known?

Ver. 9.

As to the Third, *viz.* " That we lock up  
" the *Scriptures in an Unknown Tongue*, and  
" forbid the Common People the Use of  
" them, which is contrary to *Christ's Own*  
" Design, Who exhorts the *Jews* to search the  
" *Scriptures, &c.*

*Ans.* This Proposition, as to the First Part is notoriously false, and unworthy the Character, and Reputation Dr. Tillotson was otherwise deservedly possess'd of: For he might as well have said, that it is Midnight when the Sun shines over our Heads, as tell us we lock up the *Scriptures in an Unknown Tongue*, when 'tis evident in fact, that we have them in all the *Vulgar Languages* spoken



ken in those Parts of the World, publish'd and set forth in all *Catholick Countries*, by, and for the Use and Benefit of *Roman Catholics*. Sure a Man that was so curious, and inquisitive how Affairs went both at home and abroad, cou'd not, at least, be ignorant, that the *Roman Catholics* in *England* have the *Scriptures* in their own Tongue: Did he never hear of the *Doway Bible*, or the *Rhemes Testament*? Are not these Books in their hands, and read, and us'd with all the Freedom and Liberty imaginable? As for the *French Bible*; whoever desires it, may find enough, done not only by *Protestants*, but by *Catholick Divines* also, at the *French Stationers Shops* in *London*, without being at the trouble of going any further for it. Touching *Spain, Germany, Italy*, and other *Catholick Countries*; the Inquiry is not very difficult, whether they have the *Scriptures* in *Vulgar Languages*: For we may easily meet with Men of Credit and Probity out of these Countries, who can assure us, they have the *Scriptures* in their Native Tongues. So that it is hard to imagine, what shou'd put him upon asserting a thing so bare-fac'd, and destitute of the least Colour of Truth; and so peremptorily affirming what the Evidence of our Eyes and Ears, and even Daily Experience, can so easily contradict.

I know, he, and others of his Mind, do vouch the Decree of the *Council of Trent* concerning prohibited Books, for what they say; and found all the railing Accusations they bring against the *R. Catholics* thereupon:  
Which

Which is as much as to say, *That, tho' we have the Bible in all Vulgar Languages, and see, and read it in the same Languages, yet we must believe it is lock'd up in an Unknown Tongue, which we do not understand*; because these Gentlemen will have it, that the Council of Trent hath so decreed. But, besides that it is a hard Case to which these Gentlemen wou'd reduce us, viz. *That we must not believe what we see, feel, hear, and understand*, contrary to their own ordinary Rule; the Council of Trent does not in the least favour their Pretension. I shall subjoin the very Words of that Council, and leave it to speak for it self. " Since Experience sheweth, that, if

" the Sacred Bible were permitted indifferently, and without Distinction, in Vulgar Language; such a Liberty (by reason of Men's Rashness) wou'd occasion more Hurt than Good; be it left to the Bishop's, or Inquisitor's Judgment, by, and with the Advice of the Parish Priest, or Confessor, to give leave to read the Versions of *Catholick Authors* in Vulgar Language, to such as may, in their Opinion, receive not a Loss, but an Increase of Faith and Piety thereby; Which Leave they are to have in Writing. *De Lib. prob. Reg. iv.*

P 2

Hence

litatis oriri; hac in parte, Judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum Consilio Parochi vel Confessarii *Biblicorum a Catholicis Authoribus* versorum Lectionem in Vulgaris Linguae concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi Lectione non Damnum sed Fidei atque Pietatis Augmentum capere posse: Quam Facultatem in Scriptis habeant. *De Lib. prob. Reg. iv.*

Cum Experimento manifestum sit si Sacra Biblia Vulgari Lingua passim sine Discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob Hominum Temeritatem, Detrimenti quam Utilitatis oriri;

Hence I think it is plain, the Council is so far from locking up the Scripture in an Unknown Tongue, that it gives free leave to every one, whom the Bishop, or Inquisitor, with the Advice of the Parish Priest, or Confessor, shall judge meet to read it in *Vulgar Language*. And since there is nothing so proper, nor so powerful to increase Faith and Piety, in a meek and humble Soul, as the Sacred Scripture, 'tis plain, that no sincere Christian is barr'd, by this Decree, from the Use of it in *Vulgar Language*. And if any such shou'd happen to be refus'd leave to read it, which we have no reason to suppose, 'tis contrary to the Spirit and Intention of the Council, who orders that Persons so dispos'd, may have the free Use of them. And however this (no great) Restraint was necessary in those Days, when Mens Minds were in a ferment, and the Itch of Novelty had seiz'd them, as it commonly happens when any New Opinions are broach'd; yet, when they began to see with their own Eyes, and became more still and calm, the Governours of the Church were so far from hindering them the Use of the Scripture, or putting this Decree in execution, that they exhort all Persons to read and meditate upon them, as the most effectual Means to bring them acquainted with the Will of God, and their Duty to Him. And now methinks, Dr. Tillotson and his Party are, of all others, the unfittest to reproach us of this Conduct, considering that most of the Learned Men of his Church do ingeniously own, that the promiscuous Use  
of



of the *Scripture* allow'd to all sorts of Persons, and their private Interpretations thereof, was, in a great measure, the Cause of all the different Sects, that sprung up, and divided themselves from their Communion.

As to what he says, That Christ *exhorts the Jews to search the Scriptures*; that S. Luke *commends the Bereans, for so doing*, and that the *Holy Fathers do earnestly recommend the Reading and Study of the Scriptures*, I acknowledge the Truth of this Saying; I will add to it, that all the Art and Industry, all the Rhetorick and Eloquence in the World, have not that Force and Efficacy upon pious and virtuous Souls, that the serious *Reading, and Meditating upon the Holy Scriptures* hath: Yet this notwithstanding, since Experience hath taught us, that, as the Spider extracts Poison out of the same Flower, whence the Bee gathers Honey; so I believe, no Man can doubt (considering all the Schism, and horrid Impieties now maintain'd) but that the rankest Soul-killing Poison, has been often extracted out of the Sacred *Scriptures*, not out of any Defect in them, but thro' the deprav'd Disposition, and supercilious Pride of the Readers. And therefore, I think, it is the least the Church cou'd do in a Time of Confusion and Disorder, such as was that of the *Council of Trent*, when so many were gaping after Novelty, and setting up for Heads of New Sects, to moderate the Use and *Reading* of those Sacred Writings: But still so as not to shut up the Fountain of Life, nor hinder all good and virtuous *Christians* to drink

of that Living Water; which (tho little) Restraint was yet by degrees abated, as Men began to entertain Thoughts of Peace, and Quiet; and in a few Years after, was insensibly taken away in many Countries, by a tacite Admission of *the Reading of Scripture* in Vulgar Languages to all sorts of People. And this I am sure no body can justly deny to be the Case of the *R. Catholick Church* in regard of the present Debate; which how agreeable it is to Sense and Reason, and to the Piety and Care of a tender Mother, let even the most inveterate of our Adversaries judge.

Touching the Fourth, viz. “ It cannot be  
 “ imagin’d how People shou’d square, or  
 “ measure their Faith by this Rule, unless  
 “ they were allow’d to read and understand  
 “ it.

*Ans.* The Answer to this Objection, is sufficiently imply’d in what I spoke to the former: I shall therefore add these few Words only; *That the Word of God is the Rule of our Faith, but whether it be convey’d to us by Writing, or by Word of Mouth, methinks the Scripture it self declares in favour of the latter: For Christ our Lord, as the Evangelists say, commanded His Disciples to go and preach the Gospel; but we do not find, that He gave any Injunction about giving His Word in Writing to the People, in order to learn their Faith. However, since it is confess’d, that the Sacred Scriptures are excellent Means to edifie our Faith, and compose our Manners, we do earnestly and heartily recommend them to the Study and Meditation of the People.* Concerning

Concerning the Last, viz. " That we  
 " therefore lock up the *Scripture in an Un-*  
 " *known Tongue*; because it is certain, that  
 " if the Common People were once brought  
 " to understand the *Scriptures*, they wou'd  
 " soon quit us, and go over to them.

*Ans.* This Proposition is false in all its  
 Circumstances. 1. That *we* do not *lock up the*  
*Scripture in an Unknown Tongue*, is already  
 prov'd. 2. That *the Common People wou'd*  
*not quit our Religion, &c.* will easily appear,  
 if we consider, that by the same Rule, our  
 Scholars, and Men of Letters, who *under-*  
*stand the Scripture* in that Language, which  
 they call *Unknown*, shou'd have quitted us,  
 which he well knew, they do not. Men of  
 Breeding and Sense, are less apt to be pleas'd  
 with Superstition and Errour, than the Com-  
 mon ordinary People; and we cannot sup-  
 pose, they shou'd have less regard for the  
 Good of their Souls, than ordinary People;  
 and yet, since those Men from whom we can-  
 not, if we wou'd conceal any thing in our  
 Faith or Practice, do not go over to them,  
 but persist in our Communion, I think I may  
 reasonably conclude, that the Common Peo-  
 ple wou'd do the same, were they never so  
 well read in the *Scriptures*, unless we sup-  
 pose, that the *Protestant Religion* has some vir-  
 tue to attract the Common People, upon the  
 reading of *Scripture*, in a Vulgar Tongue,  
 which is incommunicable to Men of Letters  
 when they read the same.

But, methinks, the stand the *Protestant*  
*Religion* has been at, now upwards of 100  
 P 4 Years,



Years, without gaining one Foot of Ground, nay, hardly, keeping what it had, notwithstanding, all the Liberty and Indulgence it gives to Flesh and Blood, is an evident Argument, that it was not a serious Meditation and Study of *Scripture*, but rather a Popular Fury, and something like Madness, that brought over so many of the Common People to embrace it in the Beginning. And indeed, if the Fences, and Bulwarks, wherewith the *Protestant Religion* is fortified, were taken away; if the *Test*, and Penal Laws, and other grievous Burthens laid upon *R. Catholicks*, were taken off; if all the scandalous and opprobrious Language, which Ministers thunder out in their Pulpits against the *Church*, and *Bishop of Rome*; all the false and ridiculous Tenets, which are ascrib'd to *R. Catholicks*, and manag'd with all the Art and Industry proper to inflame the People's Hatred, and to give them a perpetual Aversion to *R. Catholicks*, and their Religion; all the Marks of Infamy and Dishonour put upon them, being not permitted to bear any Civil, or Military Office, nay, scarce allowed, in some Countries, to exercise such honest Professions, or Callings, as may enable them to get their Bread, if all these fatal Engines, I say, were laid aside, and every Man left to chuse his Religion, without the Hopes of Reward, on the one side, or the Fear of Loss of Goods, and Temporal Punishment on the other, I doubt the *Protestant Religion* wou'd soon fall to pieces, and many a *Prodigal Child* wou'd return to their *Fathers Houses*, whence they  
have

have so long stray'd. But these Fences, and Barriers (shall I call them) of Religion, being so rivetted, and interwoven with the Temporal Laws, and Constitutions of most Governments, where the *Protestant Religion* sways, I fear all Reasons and Arguments, tho' never so evident, are too weak to encounter them, unless God of His Mercy be pleas'd to put His Hand to the Work: To Whose Infinite Goodness and Mercy, I do from my Heart most earnestly recommend it.

---

CHAP. VII.

*Of the Invocation of Saints.*

**W**HAT we believe to be of Faith, on this Head, is thus declar'd by the *Council of Trent*: *That the Saints, who reign with Jesus Christ, offer up to God their Prayers for Men; that it is good and profitable to invoke them after an humble manner, and to have recourse to their Prayers, Aid, and Assistance, to obtain of God His Benefits thro' our Lord Jesus Christ His Son, Who is our only Saviour and Redeemer.* Sess. 25. This the Council declares to be the Faith of the Church concerning this Point; but does not command, or oblige any of the Laity to pray to the *Saints*, or *invoke* them. 'Tis a Practice receiv'd from the Primitive Church, and us'd by the Greatest, and most Learned, and Vertuous of the Holy Fathers of those Times, as appears by their Works handed down to us by an uninterrupted Tradition. But, because it is not absolutely necessary, the Church leaves every

every one the Liberty to make use of it, or not, as they think fit: Yet, to see how Dr. Tillotson lays about him, upon this Subject, and what pains he takes to confute it, one wou'd think we have nothing in our Liturgies, and publick Prayer Books, but Prayers to *Saints*; and that we do nothing else, in the Publick and Solemn Service of the Church, but pray to *Saints*, and worship them.

Here it may be expected, I shou'd give a *Specimen* of his laborious Endeavours in this Matter; but I think a Pattern wou'd not do, and therefore I shall refer the Reader to

\* Vol.  
II. edit.  
post obit.  
Ser. 2, 3,  
4.

Three entire Sermons, \* where this Business is handled to some purpose.

Now to justify our Proceedings from these Imputations, and to shew the Reasonableness of this Practice, as by us us'd, I shall do these Four things

1. I will endeavour to shew, that to *invoke* the *Saints*, by which Words we protest and declare (and 'tis hard if we may not be allow'd to interpret our own Words) that we mean nothing else, but to desire them to pray for us, is not repugnant to the Word of God.

2. That in the Publick and Solemn Service of the Church (excepting the *Litanies of the Saints*, which are read, or sung solemnly Four times a Year; the General Confession of Sins, in the Beginning of the Mass, a few Hymns, Anthems, and Versicles, which are not Prayers strictly and properly so called; and most of which are read only once a Year, excepting these I say) we put up no Prayers

to



to *Saints*, or *Angels*; but all our Prayers are address'd to Almighty God, and to *Jesus Christ* our *Mediator* and *Redeemer*. Not but that we hold it lawful even in the Publick, and Solemn Service of the Church, to pray to the *Saints*, that is, *To desire them to pray for us*; since all the Addressees we make to the *Saints*, do finally terminate in *Jesus Christ*, in virtue of Whose Death and *Passion*, we believe the *Saints* are enabled to pray for us; but because it is Matter of Fact, that we do not address our Prayers in the Solemn Service of the Church, but to God alone.

3. I will make it appear from the very Words of the Holy Fathers, that the Practice of praying to *Saints*, was us'd in the Primitive Church. And

*Lastly*, I shall endeavour to return a brief Answer to what the Dr. thought fit to bring against this Point.

1. I will endeavour to shew, that to *invoke* the *Saints*, or (which is the same thing) to desire them to pray for us, is not repugnant to the Word of God. The *Texts of Scripture*, which seems to be against this Practice, and which the Dr. urges, are taken out of *S. Paul*, *i Tim. ii. 5.* where he says; *There is One God, and One Mediator between God and Men*, the Man Christ Jesus. And again, *Heb. ix. 15.* *For this Cause, He (Christ) is the Mediator of the New Testament, &c.* Hence the Dr. concludes, that it is contrary to the Word of God, and (which he mostly insists upon) derogatory to the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*, to pray to any *Saint*, or *Angel*;  
since

place to do so, were to constitute them Mediators between God and Men, contrary to the express Words of St. Paul.

But, sure he was not aware how far this Inference wou'd carry him, else he wou'd be a little more reserv'd. We are exhorted by the *Scriptures*, and by the Rules of Charity, we are bound to pray to God for one another: Yea, and S. Paul himself desires the *Ephesians* to pray for him, and exhorts *Timothy* to have Prayers, and Supplications put up for all Men. Do not we then constitute one another Mediators between God and our selves? Does not S. Paul make the *Ephesians* Mediators between God and himself? Most certainly, as much as we make the *Saints*; for we only desire the *Saints* to pray for us, and St. Paul desir'd the *Ephesians* to pray for him, and we desire every Day the same thing of our Brethren, and do these Mediators derogate from the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*? God forbid! Ay but says the Dr. *The Saints are in Heaven, and these Men were on Earth*: Well, and does their being present, or absent, their being *in Heaven*, or *on Earth*, make them the more or less Mediators, when they are made such, or do the Office of Mediators? Is any Man the less a Mediator, who sues for the Pardon of another, because he is present, or in the same Town, or Country with him, for whom he sues? Sure *there is not* (to use the Doctor's own Phrase) *a Controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason; but of downright Imp—* \* *against the plain Meaning*

\* Dis-  
course a-  
gainst  
Transub-  
stantiation.  
Vol.  
III. P. 299

of

of Scripture, and all the Sense and Reason of Mankind: I forbear that uncivil Word, the Reader may find it at length with the Dr. in the Place pointed at in the Margin. Well! But *the Saints are in Heaven*. What then? Why, if we desire them to pray for us, we make them Mediators. But do not *the Saints in Heaven* pray for us? Yes, the Dr. grants they do: They make themselves Mediators then. No, says he, *They are not Mediators and Intercessors properly so call'd*; for (continues he) *all Intercessions strictly and properly so called, is in virtue of a Sacrifice offer'd by him that intercedes*. Here he pulls down all that he built before, and justifies our Practice, as fully as we cou'd desire. *All Intercession strictly and properly so call'd, is in virtue of a Sacrifice offer'd by him that intercedes*: Say you so! Why then the *Saints* can by no means be Mediators, or Intercessors *properly so call'd*, whether we desire them to pray for us, or they do it of themselves; since they did not offer any *Sacrifice* by *virtue* whereof they may, in a strict and proper Sense, be call'd *Mediators*, or *Intercessors*; and then we may desire them to pray for us, or they may do it of themselves, and yet be no Mediators, or Intercessors, and consequently not derogate from the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*. And thus the Dr. has very judiciously, and, in my Opinion, very truly interpreted *S. Paul's* Words, and justified us into the Bargain.

2. " That in the Publick and Solemn Service of the Church, excepting the *Litanies, &c.* as aforesaid, we put up no Pray-

" ers

Vol. II.  
edit. obit.  
Pag. 93.



*Invocation of Saints.*

“ ers to *Saints*, or Angels; but all our Prayers are address’d to Almighty God, and to *J. Christ*, our only *Saviour* and *Redeemer*.

This will appear, by a thorough Examination of those Books, wherein the Publick Service of our Church is contain’d; which are the *Mass-Book*, and the *Breviary*; the First, containing the Solemn Service of the *Mass*, and the latter, the *Canonical Office*, namely, *Matins*, *Hours*, *Evensong*, and *Campeline*. And here I can in truth aver, that I have read both these Books, at least Ten times; yet, excepting the Litanies, the *General Confession*, some few Hymns, Anthems and Versicles, whereof One or Two are read in the *Breviary* on the Feasts of the B. V. *Mary*, and other Saints, which yet are not properly Prayers, and which only mention these Words, *Pray for us*, *Intercede for us*, or the like, I do profess I do not know One Single Prayer appointed for the Publick, and Solemn Service of the Church, in either of them address’d directly to either *Saint*, or Angel, or the B. V. *Mary*. As for the *Mass-Book*, which is the publick Liturgy of the Church, excepting the *General Confession*, there is not One Prayer in it address’d to any but God Almighty; no, not on the Feasts of *Saints*, or of the B. V. *Mary*; no, nor in the Book at all, excepting this One Versicle (which is, I think, Four times read) *Mother of God intercede for us*. Which yet is seldom read in any Publick and Solemn Service of the Church; and One Single Anthem wherein the like Words are found on the *Feast of St. Michael*.  
And

And for the Truth of all this, I appeal to the Books themselves. There is indeed a *Little Office of the Virgin Mary* annex'd to the *Breviary*, wherein the aforesaid Words, *Pray for us*, *Intercede for us*, or the like, are some Nine, or Ten times repeated in Hymns, Anthems, and Versicles; but this being read neither publickly, nor privately in the Church Service, cannot reasonably be said to pertain to it.

Now these Two Books are an Extract, the *Mass-book*, of what is most moving, and ravishing, in the *Psalms of David*; of what is most edifying and instructive, and most fit to declare the Praises of God, and to shew His Loving Kindness and Mercy to Mankind, in the *Old Testament*; and of the most useful, and necessary Precepts and Instructions of Faith and Good Manners, contain'd in the *New*, suited and adapted to all the Seasons of the Year; together with many Devout and Fervent Prayers, all tending to praise Almighty God, to thank Him for His Benefits and Blessings, and to implore Mercy and Pardon for our Sins. The *Breviary*, of all the *Psalms*; most of the *History of the Old Testament*; and Summary of all the *Epistles of the Apostles*, and the *Revelations*; some Verses of the Gospel of every Feast and Sunday in the Year, with the Homilies of the Ancient Fathers of the Church upon these Texts; together with a brief Account of the Lives of the most eminent *Saints*, and Martyrs, that flourish'd in the Church; with a great many Pious and Godly Prayers, Anthems, Hymns, and

and Versicles, address'd to God Almighty, and put up in the Name, and thro' the Merits of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. We do, indeed, commemorate the Holy Apostles, the *B. V. Mary*, and the *Saints* in the Publick Service of the Church; because we have sufficient Warrant for it in the *Scripture* and Practice of the Primitive Church. *David* says; *The Righteous shall be in Everlasting Remembrance*, Psal. cxii. and *Dr. Tillotson* himself has a Sermon upon this Subject, wherein he proves from the Practice of the Fathers, and from Reason, that it is lawful to give due Honour and Respect to the *Saints*; but we do not put up any formal Prayers to them in the Publick Service. And this will appear from the Collects in the *Mass-book* and *Breviary*, where their Names are mention'd. I will transcribe Two, or Three of them, and leave the Reader, who desires further Satisfaction, to consult these Books, whether all the rest of the Collects where the *Saints* are mention'd, be not of the same Tenor.

*A Collect on the Annunciation of the B. V. Mary.*

“ O God, Who hast been pleas'd, that  
 “ Thy Word shou'd take Flesh in  
 “ the Womb of the *B. V. Mary*, when the  
 “ Angel declar'd it; grant us Thy humble  
 “ Petitioners, who believe her to be truly  
 “ the *Mother of God*, that, by her Intercessi-  
 “ on, we may with Thee be assisted; thro'  
 “ the Same our Lord *Jesus Christ*, &c. Amen.



*A Collect on the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul.*

“ **O** God, Who hast consecrated this  
 “ Day by the Martyrdom of *Peter*  
 “ and *Paul*, grant to Thy Church to follow  
 “ their Example in all things, by whom the  
 “ Religion began; thro’ our Lord *Jesus*, &c.  
 “ *Amen.*

*A Collect on the Nativity of St. John Baptist.*

“ **O** God, Who hast honour’d this Day  
 “ with the Nativity of St. *John*,  
 “ give to Thy People the Grace of Spiritu-  
 “ al Joy; and guide the Minds of all the  
 “ Faithful in the Way of *Eternal Salvation*;  
 “ thro’ *Jesus Christ* our Lord. *Amen.*

Here, you see, all these Prayers are ad-  
 dress’d to God alone. And thus, indeed, are  
 all the Collects in the *Mass-book* and *Brevia-*  
*ry*, which I willingly submit to any Man’s  
 Trial *ad Pœnam Libri*. As to the *Office* and  
*Litanies of the B. V. Mary*, which are found  
 in *Manuals*, and read by some *R. Catholicks*;  
 there is no reason to charge them upon the  
 Publick Office, and Service of the Church,  
 since they are not us’d by the Church, nor  
 publish’d by Publick Authority. The Church  
 does, indeed, allow such Prayers to be said, as  
 far as they hold within the Compass of meer  
 Intercession, because they are founded in the  
 Practice of the Primitive Church, and all  
 succeeding Ages. Bnt if any of them contain  
 any Terms or Expressions bordering upon  
 the

the Prerogative of the Mediatorship of *Jesus Christ*, she does as heartily, and as earnestly, desire they shou'd be abolish'd as any *Protestant* whatsoever.

Touching the *Rosary*, or *Beads*, in which the Dr. reproaches us for saying Ten *Ave Maria's* for One *Pater Noster*: I believe every one knows the Church obliges no body to say it; I am sure there are Millions of *R. Catholicks* who never do. Besides, there is nothing in the *Ave Maria*, but the very Words of *Scripture*, except these Last, *Pray for us now and in the Hour of our Death*; and if it be a good thing to desire the *Mother of God* to pray for us, sure, the oft'ner we desire it, the better it is. As to the Disproportion between the *Pater Nosters*, and the *Ave Maria's*; I must confess it were something, if those who use the *Rosary*, made all their Devotion to consist in it. But it is well known, that such as say it, do to their Power, discharge all other *Christian Duties*, at least do pretend to no Exemption, upon the score of their *Beads*, or *Rosary*, from praying to Almighty God, from adoring and worshipping Him, and giving Him their humble and hearty Thanks for His Benefits and Blessings; from commemorating the Death and *Passion* of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and having recourse to the Merits thereof, for Mercy and Pardon of their Sins. And now when they have endeavour'd to discharge all these essential Duties, where lies the Harm, if they spend some part of their spare Hours, in saying, over and above, so many

*Ave*

*Ave Maria's*, especially since they are founded in the Merits of the Death and *Passion* of our Lord and *Saviour*; in virtue whereof, all *Catholicks* do hope and trust, that the *V. Mary* and all the *Saints*, will pray for them? Or how can it be counted a Fault to desire the *Virgin Mary* to do that for us, which even the Dr. himself, and all the Learned *Protestants* in the World, do acknowledge, she, and all the *Saints* in *Heaven*, constantly do, tho' we shou'd not ask it of them? Now this is plainly the Case: All *R. Catholicks* are taught and exhorted by the Church, to discharge first their Duty to God, to worship and adore Him, to put up their Prayers to Him, to thank Him for His Benefits, to be sorry for their Sins, to beg Mercy and Forgiveness thro' the Merits of the *Passion* of our Lord *Jesus Christ*; and when this is done, if they will take the *Lady's Office*, or the *Litanies of the Saints*, or the *V. Mary*, or their *Beads*, and beg those great Friends and Favourites of *Jesus Christ*, who shed their Blood, and lay down their Lives for the Truth of His *Gospel*; to recommend them to Him, and His *Heavenly Father*, is it not better (since the Mind of Man must always be in *Action*) than spend the time in Idleness, or, perhaps, in Evil Conversation? In a word, these are Devotions, which certain Fraternities, and Regular Societies, have taken upon them to discharge over and above the necessary, and essential Duties of *Christianity*: and which other *Catholicks* (to be Partakers of the Prayers of the said Fraternities and

Q 2

Societies)



Societies) do also perform. But in saying their *Beads*, they do not always, as the Dr. wou'd suggest, say Ten *Ave Maria's* for One *Pater Noster*: For several Fraternities and *Catholicks*, say all *Pater Nosters* without ever an *Ave Maria*. But of this enough. I proceed to shew.

3. From the very Words of the Holy Fathers, that this Practice of praying to *Saints* was us'd in the Primitive Church.

S. *Ambrose* delivers his Thoughts in these Words: *We ought to pray to the Angels in our own behalf, who are given as a Guard to us: We ought to pray to the Martyrs, whose Bodies remaining with us seem to be, as it were, a Pledge of their Protection.* Lib. de Viduis prope Fin.

*Gregory Nissen* speaks thus to the Martyr S. *Theodorus*: *Intercede and pray for your Country with our Common Lord, and King.* Or. in S. Theo.

S. *Austin*: *We do not commemorate the Martyrs at the Lord's Table, as we do those, who die in the Peace of the Church; but we do commemorate them, that they may pray for us, that we may follow their Steps.* Tract. lxxxiv. in Joa. Again: *Holy Mary \* succour the Distressed, help the Pessimillanimous, cherish those that mourn, pray for the People, mediate for the Clergy, intercede for the devout Female Sex, let every one perceive thy Assistance, who celebrate thy Commemoration.* Ser. xviii de Sanctis.

\* Note,  
That the  
Sermon,  
whence  
this Pas-  
sage is ta-  
ken, is as-  
crib'd by  
some Cri-  
ticks to St  
*Fulgenti-*  
*us*; but

whether of the Two it belongs to it matters not, being both Fa-  
thers of great Renown, and of the same Age.

*Theodoret*: *We do not address our selves unto the Martyrs, as unto Gods, but we pray unto them*

them as Divine Men, that they wou'd please to become Legates (or Intercessors) for us. Ser. viii. de Martyr. Lib. Curat. Græc. Affect.

The Council of Calcedon. Act. xi. has these Words: *Φλαυσιανος μετὰ θάνατον ζῇ Μαρτυρὺς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐυξέσται*, *Flavianus liveth after his Death; the Martyr will pray for us; or, as the Translators render it, Let the Martyr pray for us; it being usual with Orientals to put the Future Tense for the Imperative.*

Here is a General Council of more than 600 Bishops desiring the Martyr *Flavianus* to pray for them. This Council was held in the Year 451, and is One of the Four First General Councils, whose Acts and Decrees the Church of England Divines do profess to receive. So that it cannot be enough admir'd, what shou'd induce them to reject the *Invocation of Saints*.

I shou'd never end, if I shou'd bring all the Sayings of the Fathers on this Subject. St. *Austin* has a long Discourse upon it against *Faustus the Manichean*, where he gives at large the Reasons why the *Catholick Church* gives due Honour to the Martyrs, and desires the Assistance of their Prayers: And S. *Jerome* wrote a Book against *Vigilantius* upon this Subject, and calls him *Heretick* for denying the Lawfulness of praying to *Saints*.

I shall therefore conclude with this Reflection; That it is not reasonable to believe, nay 'tis incredible, that these Holy Fathers, who took so much pains to propagate the Faith and Gospel of Jesus Christ; who wrote so many Learned and Voluminous Works, which breathe so

# Invocation of Saints.

much Piety and Christian ; spent all their Lives in Holy, and Religious Exercises ; consecrated their Time and Labour to the Service of the True and Living God, and were ready to lay down their Lives for the Truth of the Doctrine, which they taught and practis'd, if Occasion requir'd, shou'd at the same time, write, and practise a Doctrine, which derogates from the Honour, and Mediatorship of Jesus Christ ; it being their chief Study and Care, to inculcate to the World, that He was the Only Lord and Mediator, in Whose Name and no other, Salvation was to be had. But if the Dr. shou'd say (as many of his Brethren have) that all these Holy Fathers err'd, and consequently did not understand the Doctrine they labour'd so earnestly to propagate ; I answer him, as S. *Austin* did a certain Man, to whom, I fear, the Dr. was in some things, but too near akin ; *Mallet cum eis errare, quam tecum consentire: I had rather err with the Fathers, than agree with him.*

Thus I have endeavour'd, as plainly and briefly as I cou'd, to shew how reasonable, how harmless, how inoffensive, the *Invocation of Saints* is, and how agreeable to the Practice of the Holy Fathers, and the Primitive Church. I now proceed.

“ Lastly, To return a brief Answer to  
“ what Dr. *Tillotson* thought fit to bring a-  
“ gainst this Point.

Here I wou'd not be understood, as if I meant to answer all the little Objections, and pretty Querks of Wit, which he endeavours to improve with all his Art and Eloquence ; in order, no Doubt, to catch the  
well-meaning,



well-meaning, but weaker sort of People, with this Fig-leaf Cover; which yet all sober thinking Men may easily see thro'. My Design is to answer only such Objections as have any real or apparent Difficulties, being convinc'd that things naked, or so thinly cover'd, need no Reading upon.

His First Objection is taken out of S. Paul, *Colos. ii. 18, 19.* Where the Apostle says, *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility, and worshipping of Angels, not holding the Head.* By which Words, says the Dr. St. Paul intimates, that for *Christians* to address themselves to God by any other Mediator, than *Jesus Christ* only, was a Defection from the Head. This, he says, is *Theodore's* Interpretation of that Passage in his Comment upon it, and the Third Chapter, V. 17. of the same Epistle: And to inforce this Interpretation, he cites a Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* which says, *That Christians ought not to forsake the Church of God, and go away from it, and to invoke Angels, and to make Conventicles, all which are forbidden; if therefore any be found giving himself to this secret Idolatry, let him be Anathema, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and is gone over to Idolatry.* After which Words, the Dr. breaks out into this Exclamation: "What shall be said to  
" them, who do not only secretly and in  
" their Private Devotions, but in the Pu-  
" blick Assemblies of *Christians*, and in the  
" most Publick Offices of their Church, in-  
" vocate Angels, and pray to them.

Vol. II.  
edit. post  
obit. Pag.  
43, 44, 45

### Invocation of Saints.

Before I answer this Objection, it won't be amiss to clear the Equivocation, which in most Controversial Disputes, commonly attends these Two Words, *Worship* and *Invocation*. *Worship* is render'd in *Latin*, *Colo*, or *Adoro*; in *Greek*, *προσκυνέω*; in *Hebrew* *חנן*; and in these Three Languages, 'tis us'd in *Scripture*, and in common Discourse, not only to signify the Supreme *Worship* and Honour, we pay to Almighty God, but also for all sort of Respect and Reverence done to Kings, Princes, and Persons of Condition. Of this we have innumerable Examples in *Scripture*; and not only so, but the very Word, which we use to signify the Supreme Worship due to God alone, is sometimes apply'd to Humane Affairs: For, as we say, *Colere Deum*, To worship God; *Colere Parentes*, To honour our Parents; so we say, *Colere Vineam*, *Colere Agrum*, *Hortum*, &c. To till the Vineyard; To till the Ground, &c. Yet no Man ever said, that we rob God of his due Honour, by using the same Expression to signify the Respect we pay some Creatures, which we use when we express the Honour due only to Him; because the different Ideas, or Notions we have of God, and these Creatures, sufficiently determine our Meaning; tho' the Want of Words, or rather the Conveniency of delivering our Thoughts in fewer Words, oblige us to make use of the same Terms to express these different Services.

In like manner, the Word *Invocation* is us'd in *Scripture*, not only to signify our Calling upon God, as our Sovereign Lord  
and

and Maker; but it is also us'd and apply'd in several Places to ordinary Men. For Instance; *Isaiah* says, *Seven Women shall take hold of One Man, saying, We will eat our own Bread, and wear our own Apparel, only let thy Name be invocated upon us, to take away our Reproach: Tantum invocetur Nomen tuum super nos.* Cap. iv. 1. So that if we do not attend to the Subject Matter, to which these Words are apply'd, the *Scripture* will afford us sufficient Grounds for *Worshipping*, and *Invocating* not only God, Angels, and Saints, but even common ordinary Men. To worship and invoke then, must necessarily mean, *To exhibit a Service, and Duty to those, whom we worship and call upon, according to the Notion or Idea we have of their Excellency and Perfection, and of the Power and Ability we conceive in them to help and assist us.* And then to worship God and invoke Him, must mean, *To pay Him the Supreme Honour and Respect which is due only to the Great Creatour and Redeemer of the World; and to beg Mercy and Forgiveness of Him, as the Source and Fountain of all Goodness; but to worship and invoke the Angels and Saints, must mean no more than To shew them that Respect and Honour, which is due to the Friends and Courtiers of our Sovereign Lord, and to ask their Help and Assistance in those things, which we conceive they are able to do, that is, To pray for us, and to recommend us to their, and our Great Master; because these only are the Excellencies and Abilities we conceive the Angels and Saints to be indued with, and for which we respect them.* This suppos'd, I answer,



1. That *S. Paul* speaks here of certain Hereticks, who separated from the Faithful, and gave to Angels the Supreme *Worship* and Honour, which is due only to God; as these Words of his, *Not holding the Head*, do plainly denote: For by these Words he gives us to understand, that these Hereticks departed from *Christ*, Which is the *Head*; and by these other Words, *Worshipping of Angels*, that they offer'd Sacrifice to Angels, whom they believ'd to have been the Mediators of the *New Covenant*, or as *Theodore* phrases it, *That the Law was given by Angels*. But this, I hope the *Protestants* will not say, we believe, or hold.

2. That the Doctor's Interpretation of *St. Paul's* Words is altogether forc'd, and by no means warranted by *Theodore*, or any Ancient Father of the Church; on the contrary, *Theodore* is entirely ours: For he says, in that very Place cited by the Doctor, that therefore these *Hereticks* worshipp'd *Angels*, because *they believ'd, the Law was given by them*. He says, indeed, in another Place which the Dr. quotes, *That we must send up Thanksgivings to God and the Father, by Christ, and not by the Angels*. And this, I hope, we are careful to do; for I am sure we put up all our Prayers to *God and the Father*, by, or thro' the Merits of *Jesus Christ*, and not of any *Angel* or *Saint*. But sure it is not reasonable to believe, that *Theodore* there meant, *That we ought not to desire the Angels or Saints, to pray for us*; since he himself, as I observ'd before, so expressly says, *We do not address our selves*

selves to the Saints as Gods, but we pray unto them as Divine Men, that they wou'd please to be Legates (or Intercessors) for us.

3. That the Canon of the Council of Laodicea, as Theodoret tells us, speaks only of these Hereticks meant by S. Paul, who forsook the Church, and gave themselves to secret Idolatry, that is (as the Fathers have always understood that Word) offer'd Sacrifice to Angels. But the Words of this Canon are so plain and full to the purpose, that there needs no Reading upon it.

Comment in  
Epist. ad  
Colos. c.  
iii. v. 17.

4. That the Dr. might very well have forborn his Exclamation; for I assure him, that excepting the General Confession, as aforesaid, we do not invoke, or pray to Angels in the publick Offices of the Church. We have but One Feast in the Year, wherein we commemorate Angels, which is that of St. Michael the Arch-angel; and in this excepting One Anthem, in the Breviary, and One Versicle, in the Mass, which are not properly Prayers, where 'tis said, in the First; Arch-angel Michael be mindful of us, and pray for us to the Son of God; and in the Second; Holy Michael defend us in Battle, that we perish not in the dreadful Judgment; there is no Invoking or Putting up of Prayers to S. Michael, or any other Angel. But it seems the Dr. was warm upon the Matter, and in such a Case, Rhetorical Exclamations are more pardonable; pray God they may be pardon'd him in Heaven.

His Second Objection is to this purpose.  
" Meditation and Intercession is founded in  
" the Merit and Virtue of this Sacrifice, by  
which

Vol.  
II. edit.  
post obit.  
Pag. 56,  
57.

“ which Expiation for Sin is made; but this  
 “ *Jesus Christ* and no other has done: There-  
 “ fore He only is Mediator and Intercessor.

*Ans.* This Argument proves too much: For it proves, that neither our Brethren, on *Earth*, nor the *Saints* in *Heaven*, ought, or can lawfully pray or intercede for us, because they did not offer *the Sacrifice, by which Expiation for Sin is made.* Yet the Dr. grants, that both our Brethren, on *Earth*, and the *Saints* in *Heaven*, may, and do pray for us. Well, but granting that *Mediation and Intercession is founded in the Virtue and Merit of the Sacrifice, by which Expiation for Sin is made.* Does it therefore follow, that the *Saints* may not charitably beg of God, to forgive us our Sins? 'Tis true, *Christ* only has a Right and Title to meditate and intercede for us, because He alone paid the Ransom, and full Value of our Sins, and therefore may in justice, ask of His *Father* to forgive us. But sure, this does not hinder, but that the *Saints* may do us that charitable Office, as to pray to God to have mercy upon us, tho' they cannot in justice demand it. May not a Friend and Favourite of the King beg the Life of a penitent Criminal? And have not Kings and Princes often granted such Favours to their Friends, tho' they were not in justice bound to do so? And are not the *Saints* in *Heaven* *Christ's* Favourites? Does

Joh. xv.  
 14.  
 Mat. xix.  
 28.

not He call them His Friends? *Vos Amici Mei estis.* And what is more, does not He tell His Apostles, that they shall sit upon *Thrones, judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel?*

And



And why may not then these Judges, and Friends, and Favourites of *Jesus Christ*, beg of Him to have mercy upon poor miserable Sinners; tho' they cannot in Justice require it at His Hands? But the Doctor's Mistake consists in this, that he does not (or rather will not) distinguish between an Intercession founded in Justice and Equity, and an Intercession founded only in Favour and Good Will: The First, I grant is peculiar only to *Christ*, for the Reasons offer'd by the Dr. but the Second, which is the Effect of Charity, is common to every one, who is possess'd of that Divine Vertue. Well, but says the Dr. *The Mediation or Intercession of Saints is not properly speaking Intercession.* So say I; for I own, that in the Sense, in which *Christ* is both our Mediator and Intercessor, the *Saints* and Angels, in the same Sense, cannot be call'd Intercessors; but whether he calls them Intercessors in a proper, or an improper Sense, 'tis all one to me. Since he acknowledges, they do pray for us, and intercede with God in our behalf, I am satisfied, for I am sure we desire no more of them.

After this, the Dr. gives us a great many Passages out of the Fathers, to prove the *Invocation of Saints* unlawful; namely out of *S. Irenaus*, *Origen*, *Novatian* (for he must be a Father too) *Clemens Romanus*, *S. Athanasius*, *S. Epiphanius*, *S. Chrysostom*, and (which I must admire at) out of *S. Austin*, who (if *Invocation of Saints* be *Popery*) was, I am sure, a rank *Papist*. But the Dr. might have spar'd himself the Labour of quoting these Passages; for

Ibid.  
Pag. 76,  
77, 78, 79  
80, 81, 82  
83.

there

there is not one of them all, to which any *Roman Catholick* wou'd refuse to subscribe; and therefore I have no Temptation to vex or trouble them.

His Third Objection is levell'd at the *Bishop of Meaux's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, which says, " We pray  
" to the *Saints* in *Heaven*, in the same Or-  
" der of Brotherly Society, with which we  
" intreat our Brethren upon *Earth* to pray  
" for us. *But that this* (says he) *is not a true*  
*Representation of their Doctrine, will appear by*  
*these Considerations.*

1. " That they pray (*continues he*) to the  
" *Saints* and Angels in *Heaven* with the  
" same solemn Circumstances of Religious  
" Worship, that they pray to God Himself.

2. " That, in their Prayers and Thanksgi-  
" ving, they join the Angels, and the *B. Vir-*  
" *gin*, and the *Saints* together with God and  
" *Christ*.

3. " That in the Creed of *Pope Pius IV.* it  
" is expresly said, the *Saints*, which reign  
" with *Christ*, are to be worshipp'd and in-  
" vocated.

4. " That in the Publick Offices of their  
" Church, they do not only pray to the *Saints*  
" to pray for them, but they direct their Pray-  
" ers and Thanksgivings immediately to  
" them for all those Blessings and Benefits,  
" which they ask of God, and thank Him for,  
" of which innumerable Examples (*adds he*)  
" might be given out of their Publick Offices;  
" particularly in the *Office of the B. Virgin*,  
" they pray to the Angels thus; *Deliver us*

we beseech you, by your Command from all our Sins.

To which I answer,

i. That there never was a Book more universally commended and approv'd in the *Latin Church*, than the *Bishop of Meaux's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*. The *Pope* highly commended, and approv'd it, as appears by his Brief to this Bishop, annex'd to the said Book. All the Cardinals and Consistory in *Rome* approv'd it, as the Letters of the *Master of the Sacred Palace*, and the *Consultor of the Holy Office*, do witness; and all the Learned Bishops and Prelates of the *R. Catholick Church* have very much approv'd, and commended it, as appears by the Letters of many of them to the said Bishop and his Friends, all which are likewise annex'd to the said Book. It has been translated into almost all the *Vulgar Tongues* in *Europe*, and is read, and perus'd by all *R. Catholics*, with all the Satisfaction and Content imaginable; so that to say, this *Exposition* is not a true Representation of the *Doctrine*, and Practice of the *R. Catholick Church* in this Matter, is as unreasonable in it self, as it is injurious to that Great and Learned Prelate, and to the whole *Catholick Church*, which hath so universally approv'd it.

2. As to his First Consideration; I have already prov'd, that we address no Prayers to *Saints* or *Angels* in the Publick Service of the Church, but that all our Prayers are directed to God only; and as to our Posture in the Church, or at our Private Devotions, whether



whether kneeling, or standing, or bowing; we declare our Intention is to adore God alone, and none else.

Ibid.  
Pag. 80,  
81.

Touching his Second Consideration, viz. *That in their Prayers and Thanksgiving, they join the Angels, and the B. Virgin and the Saints together with God and Christ.* Of this he gives us, in another Place, these Instances. *Nothing so frequent with them,* says he, *as to join the Blessed Virgin with God and our Saviour in the same Breath; nothing so common in their Mouth, as Jesus Maria,— Glory to God and the B. Virgin, and in the Roman Missal,* adds he, *they make confession of their Sins to God Almighty and the Blessed Virgin, and to S. Michael the Archangel, and to all the Saints.*

To which I answer.

3. That it is very true, we join God, and his *Saints* together in the same breath, as the Dr. saith; but, then our Plea is, that we are taught both by the *Old and New Testament* so to do. For Instance. *All the Congregation blessed the Lord God of their Fathers; and bowing their Heads, worshipp'd the Lord and the King.* i *Chron.* xxix. 20. Here at the same time, and in the same Act, and in the same Breath too, 'tis said, that the *Israelites* worshipp'd God, and the King. Had we but any such thing in our Publick Offices, what Work wou'd the Dr. make on't! Again, *The People greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel,* i *Kings* xii. 18. Here again, God and *Samuel* are join'd together in the same Breath. Again, *It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no other Burthen,* *Acts* xv. 28. Again, *I charge thee be-*  
fore

fore God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, 1 Tim. v. 21. S. John writes to the Seven Churches in Asia; Grace be unto you, and Peace from Him Which is, and Which was, and Which is to come; and from the Seven Spirits, which are before His Throne; and from Jesus Christ, Rev. Ch. i. Had we offer'd Peace from the Angels to our Flocks, and placed them before Jesus Christ, how loud wou'd he cry! Yet no less than an Apostle of Jesus Christ hath done it. What will the Dr. say to all this? Is not God here join'd with Angels, and Saints and Men, in the same Breath? And must it be a Crime in us to do that, whereof we have such manifest Precedents, in the very Words of the Scripture. Truly, to weigh well the Matter, one wou'd almost swear the Dr. was not in earnest; but were I of Council for him, I shou'd have advis'd him, if he had a mind to exhibit such ridiculous Scenes, not to make the Religion of Jesus Christ, a Theater of Laughter and Sport; For God is not mock'd.

As to his Third Consideration: I answer.

4. That Pope Pius IV. his Worshipping and Invoking the Saints, is to be understood in the same Order of Brotherly Society in which we worship and reverence our Holy Brethren on Earth, upon account of their Piety and Vertue; and in which we treat them to pray for us, as the Bishop of Meaux saith, and as St. Austin said long since: *Colimus Martyres eo Cultu Dilectionis & Societatis, quo in hac Vita coluntur Sancti Dei Homines.* We worship the Martyrs with that Worship of Love

R

and

and Fellowship wherewith the Holy Men of God are worship'd in this Life, L. xx. C. xxij. con. Faust.

All the Difficulty then of these and the like Phrases, which we read in *Scripture*, in the *Fathers*, and in the *Decrees of Councils* and *Popes*, consists in the *Ambiguity* of these Words, *Worship* and *Invoke*, which I have on purpose explain'd in the *Beginning* of this *Dispute*, to avoid *Confusion*; and which the *Catechism* publish'd by *Order* of the *Council of Trent*, and many other *Learned Divines* have so clearly and fully explain'd. So that nothing but an *Itch of Contention*, and a *Spirit of Wrangling*, cou'd make any *Man* doubt of our *Sense* of these Words. But the *Passage* of *S. Austin* is so clear and full to the purpose, that I hope the *Reader* will not be sorry to have it at large, tho' it be something long; and the rather, because it is in answer to a certain *Manichee*, who, about 1200 Years since, reproach'd *S. Austin* with what the *Dr.* and his *Party* charge the *Roman Catholicks* at present.

“ The *Christian People* (says this Father)  
 “ do celebrate the *Memory* of the *Martyrs*  
 “ with a *Religious Solemnity*, to excite us  
 “ to their *Imitation*, to be *Partakers* of their  
 “ *Merits*, and to be assisted by their *Prayers*. Yet so as, that we erect no *Altars* to  
 “ the *Martyrs*, but to the *God of Martyrs*;  
 “ tho' in remembrance of the *Martyrs*. For,  
 “ who of the *Prelates* standing at the *Altar*,  
 “ where the *Bodies* of the *Saints* are, ever  
 “ said, I offer to you *Peter, Paul, or Cyprian*?  
 “ But that which is offer'd, is offer'd to *God*,  
 “ Who



“ Who crown’d the Martyrs at the Memo-  
 “ rial \* of those, whom He crown’d ; to the \* *Altars*  
 “ End that from the Remembrance of those *where the*  
 “ places, greater Affection may rise in us, *Relicks of*  
 “ to whet our Love towards those we *Martyrs*  
 “ may imitate, and towards Him (God) by *were kept.*  
 “ Whose help, we shall be able to imitate.  
 “ *We worship then the Martyrs, with that Wor-*  
 “ *ship of Love and Fellowship wherewith Holy*  
 “ *Men in this Life are Worshipp’d,* whose  
 “ Hearts we perceive prepar’d for the like  
 “ Passion, in defence of the Truth of the Gos-  
 “ pel ; but the Martyrs we worship so much  
 “ the more devoutly by how much the more  
 “ securely, when the Fight is over ; and by  
 “ how much the more confidently we may  
 “ praise the Conquerors now in a happy  
 “ state, than those, who as yet, are fighting  
 “ in this Life. But with that Worship which  
 “ the *Greeks* call *λαλέσια*, and in *Latin* cannot  
 “ be render’d in one Word ; since it is a cer-  
 “ tain Service properly due to God alone,  
 “ we do not worship, nor teach to be wor-  
 “ shipp’d but One God. And since the Offe-  
 “ ring Sacrifice pertains to this Worship,  
 “ whence Idolatry is imputed to those, who  
 “ give it to Idols, we do by no means offer  
 “ any such thing, nor command to be offer’d  
 “ either to any Martyr, or any Holy Soul,  
 “ or Angel. And whosoever falls into any  
 “ such Errour, he is reprehended by whole-  
 “ some Doctrine to the end he may amend  
 “ or be shunn’d. *L. xx. C. xxii. con. Faust. Man.*  
 “ As to his Last Consideration, viz. “ That  
 “ in the Publick Offices of their Church, they

“ do not only pray to the *Saints* to pray for  
 “ them, but they direct their Prayers and  
 “ Thanksgivings immediately to them, for all  
 “ those Blessings and Benefits, which they ask  
 “ of God, and thank him for. I answer ;

5. That this is a notorious Imposition upon us, and as great a Mark of Insincerity, as it is a Sign of a sinking Cause, which needs such Foul Play to support it. In short, there is nothing more common than the *Roman Missal* and *Breviary*, which contain all the Publick Offices of the Church ; and I challenge any Man to find as much as One Single Prayer in either of these Books, read in the Publick Offices of the Church, which is directed immediately to either Angel or *Saint* for all those Benefits and Blessings, which we ask of God and thank him for. As for that Example, which he gives us out of the Office of the *B. Virgin*, as he says, namely, *That we pray to Angels thus*, Deliver us, we beseech you, by your Command from all our Sins : If it were true, that there is such a Prayer in it, 'tis not to the Doctor's purpose ; for that Office is no part of the Publick Offices of the Church, nor was it ever publicly read in the Church. But that it is not true, I am an Eye-witness, for I have, upon this very Occasion, read every Word of that Office (I mean the Office of the *B. Virgin* annex'd to the *Breviary*) and I can in truth aver, that I found no such Prayer or Anthem, or Versicle in it. As to any other Offices of the *B. Virgin*, made and publish'd by Private Men, whether there be any such Prayer in them,

'tis

'tis more than I can tell; for I have not read them all. This I am certain, that if there be, 'tis more than any Man is warranted by the Church to do. However, since none of these Offices of the *Virgin Mary* make any part of the Publick Offices, and Service of the Church, nor are ever publicly read in it: The Dr. had no reason to charge such Prayers upon the Publick Offices of the Church, tho' they were found in those Private Offices of the *Blessed Virgin*.

His Fourth Objection is to this purpose: Vol. II.  
Pag. 70.  
 " To pray to *Saints* in all Places, and at all  
 " Times, and for all sorts of Blessings, does  
 " suppose them to have the incommunica-  
 " ble Perfections of the Divine Nature im-  
 " parted to them, or inherent in them,  
 " namely, *Omnipotence*, and *Omniscience*,  
 " and *Immense Presence*.

*Ans.* This is the great Popular Argument, that takes so much with the weaker sort of People, who measure all things by their own Capacity, and do not conceive how *Saints* and Angels shou'd hear at so great a Distance, because they cannot do so themselves. It will be therefore requisite to take some pains to clear this Difficulty, and if it be possible, to disabuse these simple, but well-meaning People, concerning these Gross and Carnal Thoughts; which, that I may the more plainly do, I shall lay down these known, and evident Grounds.

1 That *Angels and Saints in Heaven*, have naturally a Faculty of understanding, and communicating their Thoughts; that is, a Power



*Invocation of Saints.*

connatural to their Being, of perceiving the thoughts of others, that are directed to them and of imparting their own thoughts to others; for these are essential Properties of Intelligent Beings.

2. That *Angels and Saints in Heaven*, do neither see, nor hear in the Sense we commonly take these Words: For, seeing they neither have Eyes, nor Ears, which are the Organs of Seeing and Hearing, they cannot be said properly to see or hear, but only to understand; which is what we mean, when we say, the *Saints* do hear us.

3. Hence follows, That *Saints and Angels* may hear, that is, understand us, when we direct our Thoughts to them, at any Distance, even at Ten Millions of Miles, as well as if they had been in the same Room with us: For since our Words or Thoughts are not convey'd to them by means of any Organs, nor by the Motion, or Impulse of the Air, as it happens with us; 'tis evident, that Distance or Nearness of Place can have no part in their way of understanding.

4. That God Almighty is able to reveal in an Instant all our Prayers to the *Angels and Saints*, be they never so far distant from us; tho' *Angels and Saints* are not, properly speaking, distant from us; distant in Propriety of Speech, being that Space, which is between Two Bodies.

Now, whether we conceive that the *Angels and Saints*, when we direct our thoughts to them do hear, or rather understand us by that Natural Faculty which is essential to all Intelligent Beings; or that God reveals our thoughts to them, we do not ascribe any of the incommunicable Perfections of the  

Divine

Divine Nature to them, namely, *Omnipotence*, *Omniscience*, *Immense Presence*, &c.

Not, if we conceive, that they understand our Prayers by that Natural Faculty, which is essential to their Being.

1. We do not ascribe *Omnipotence* to them; for *Omnipotence* supposes a Power of doing all things whatsoever possible; whereas, we suppose in the Angels and *Saints* at most, but a Power of obtaining of God those Benefits and Blessings we have need of.

2. Nor *Omniscience*, for *Omniscience* supposes a Knowledge of all things past, present, and possible to be: And we only suppose, in the *Saints*, a Knowledge of those few Prayers we put up to them.

3. Nor *Immense Presence*, for this supposes an Immensity, or a Being present not only to all the things in the World, but to Hundreds of Worlds, if there had been so many; whereas the utmost of what we suppose, can amount to no more, than that the Angels and *Saints* are present to those *Christians*, who beg their charitable Assistance.

Nor do we ascribe any of those Divine Perfections to them, if we conceive, that God reveals our Prayers to them. This the Dr. himself does not say, but endeavours to elude our Reasons, by saying, that if God reveals our Prayers to the *Saints*, we shou'd pray to Him, before every Prayer we make to the *Saints*, that he wou'd be pleas'd to reveal that Prayer to them,— But this, says he, is such a way about, as no Man wou'd take, that cou'd help it. To which I answer, that such Reasonings are

only fit to amuse the Common People, who, as I said above, measure all things, even the most sublime, by the Notions they have of those things they are here on *Earth* acquainted with; whereas the *Scripture*, and the *Fathers* tells us, that the Manner of God's revealing His Will to His *Angels* and *Saints*, is so mysterious, and the Knowledge and Power of these Blessed Spirits so vast, and to us, so incomprehensible, that nothing on *Earth*, much less such poor Stuff as the *Dr.* brings, is able to give us the least Glimpse how these things are perform'd.

Vol. II.  
edit. post  
Ob. Pag.  
46.

The Doctor's Last Objection is founded in a Parallel, which he makes between the *Pagan Saints* (as he calls them) and the *Christian Saints*. He tells us, *The Gentiles address'd themselves to God by innumerable Mediators, by Angels and the Souls of their departed Heroes, which were the Pagan Saints.* This he repeats in several Places, with no material Addition, only that, in speaking to the pretended Worship we give to Images, he adds, *That all our distinctions are no other, but what the Heathens us'd in the same Case.* And taking this for granted, he leaves his Auditors to conclude, that as it was Idolatry in the Heathens to worship these *Pagan Saints*, so it is in the Church of Rome to worship the *Christian Saints*.

Ibid.  
Pag. 100.

*Ans.* The best way, in my Opinion, to remove this Difficulty, is to take a short view of the Character, and Worship, which the Heathens gave to their *Pagan Saints*, as the *Dr.* is pleas'd to call them (tho' without any Warrant



Warrant from the Heathen Writers, who always call them Gods) and see, whether upon the Comparison, the *Christian Saints* be, in any thing, by us treated like them. And here I shall not distrust any Man's Knowledge so far, as to bring any Authorities from Heathen Writers to confirm what I say, being resolv'd to instance only in such plain things, as our very School-boys are not ignorant of, And,

*First*, As to their Character, 'tis no less evident, that the Heathens gave these Saints the Attributes of the Supreme Being, than that they are represented in their Writings under such Circumstances of Debauchery, Lewdness, and Intemperance, as the greatest Debauchees are hardly capable of. The Dr. cannot deny, but *Jupiter* (to omit several others) was reckon'd a Hero in his Time, according to the Pagan Belief. We are told, his Father was *Saturn*, that he was born in *Crete*, and that after his Death, he was for his great Feats, deified, and got the Supreme Dominion in *Heaven*, as his Brothers *Pluto* and *Neptune* got that of *Hell*, and the Sea. This Departed Hero is describ'd every where with the Majesty of the True God; he has Omnipotence put into his Hands: He is represented as the Great Rector and Governour of the World; and at the same time, is said to be sully'd with all the Lewdness and Debauchery imaginable.

Now the *Christian Heroes*, or *Saints*, are quite of another Complexion: We give them none of the Attributes of the True God. We believe

Luke  
xxii. 30.

believe they fought stoutly under the Banner of *Jesus Christ*, reduc'd Kings and Princes (not by their Swords, but by their Sufferings) to His Subjection, and laid down their Lives for the Truth of His Doctrine; but we do not put Omnipotence into their Hands. We believe they did work Miracles, and wondrous things; but then we do not say, they did these things by their own Power and Virtue; but that they were the happy Instruments by which God wrought these Miracles, in confirmation of the Word, which He put in their Mouth. We believe the *Saints* are great Friends and Favourites of the True God, because *Jesus Christ* has so declar'd. He tells us, that *as His Father hath appointed unto him, so hath He appointed unto them a Kingdom, that they might eat and drink at His Table in His Kingdom*; by which Metaphor of Eating and Drinking, He gives us to understand, that they are Partakers of the same Glory and Bliss with Himself in *Heaven*. But we say, the *Saints* can do nothing of themselves; but that all their Sufficiency is from God, Who made them what they are.

And then, as to their Lives and Conversation, I hope the Dr. wou'd not put me upon proving, that the Apostles, and the *B. V. Mary*, and the *Saints* in *Heaven* are in no manner concern'd in the Lewdness, and Intemperance of the Pagan Saints, or that we do not ascribe any such thing to them. So that, as to the Character, the Pagan and *Christian Saints* have no more Resemblance than Black and White.

Secondly,

*Secondly*, As to the Worship: The Heathens worshipp'd their Gods, or *Pagan Saints* (as the Dr. wou'd have it) upon a false Pretence of their Power and Greatness in *Heaven*; whereas there was no such Gods, or Saints. But we honour and respect the *Christian Saints*, because we are warranted by the Word of God, that they are such as we represent them. The Heathens erected Altars to their Gods; but we make Altars for none, but One God only. They offer'd Sacrifice to all their Gods and Saints, which is the chief Mark of Supreme Worship; but we offer Sacrifice only to the True and Living God, as Malice it self cannot deny. They made Idols, and believ'd that their Gods came, and dwelt in them; and that many of them spake, and eat, and drank; and for that reason they worshipp'd them, and therefore are justly call'd Idolaters, because they worship'd things that were not; but we only put up in our Churches, the *Images and Pictures of Jesus Christ*, the Living God, and of such as, we are sure, are truly *Saints*; but do not believe that there is any Vertue or Divinity in them for which they ought to be worshipp'd: On the contrary, we are expressly forbid to give these Pictures, or Images, any manner of Worship for their own sake; but that the Respect, which we shew them, is to be referr'd to the Originals, namely to *Christ* and His *Saints*. And sure these things, which represent *Christ* and His *Saints* to our Eyes, and put us in mind of the Death and *Passion* of the One, and of the Patience and Sufferings



ings of the others, are worthy of some Respect, and may very well be honour'd upon account of what they represent, without any Danger of Idolatry, as the Pictures of Kings, and Princes, and other Men by whom we receive Benefits are in their own Degree, confessedly respected, and had in esteem, without any such Suspicion. In one word, the Heathens call'd all their *Heroes*, or *Saints*, *Gods*; sacrific'd to them, as such; worship'd them, as such; call'd upon them, as such; but we do not call the *Christian Saints*, *Gods*; we do by no means sacrifice to them, nor worship them, as Gods, nor call upon them, as Gods. So that, upon the whole Matter, the Dr. might as well resemble Sea to Dry Land, or Light to Darkness, or the obscurest Night to the brightest Day; as compare the Worship we give the *Christian Saints* to that, which the Heathens paid to their *Heroes*, or *Saints* as the Dr. is pleas'd to call them.

---

#### CHAP. VIII.

##### Of Images.

**W**HAT the Council of Trent declares concerning Images is this: That the Images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints are to be had, and kept, especially in Churches; and that due Honour and Respect is to be given them; not that we believe any Virtue, or Divinity to be in them, for which they ought to be worship'd; or that we shou'd ask any thing of them; or put any Trust or Confidence in them; as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who

put

put their trust in Idols; but because the Honour done to them, is referr'd to the Originals, which they represent. So that by those Images, which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads and bow down, we adore Christ, and reverence the Saints, whose Likeness they bear. Sef. 25. de Invocat. Sanct.

Here you see, this Council only requires that we give due Honour and Respect to Images; which signifies no more, than that we ought to give them the Honour which is due to them. But this is not all, for the Council adds, that when we uncover our Heads, or bow towards Images, we adore Christ and reverence the Saints, whose Likeness these Images bear. So that it is not so much the Images we honour as Christ and His Saints. And since 'tis confess'd, that the Types and Figures of all Sacred things, are worthy of some Respect, in proportion to what they represent; how much more ought the Types and Figures of Jesus Christ, Who is the Source and Fountain of all Holiness and Sanctification; and of the Saints (to whose Charity and Goodness we owe under God our Faith and Religion) to be had in honour and esteem. We honour and respect the Bible more than ordinary Books, tho' it is but Paper and Ink like other Books, because the Characters therein contain'd are Sacred Signs, which represent to us the Word and Will of God: And even Nature teaches us to honour and respect the Pictures and Images of Kings and Princes, and of our Friends, for the Excellency of these Persons, and the Benefits

nefits we receive by them. And why may not we likewise honour and respect those Signs or *Images*, which represent to us that, which is most Excellent, and most August in the *Christian Religion*, namely *Christ* and His *Saints*.

The chief End of *Images* and Pictures, is to adorn our Churches, to put us in mind of the *Passion* of *Christ*, and of the Piety and Vertue of the *Saints*, and to be Books to the Ignorant. And what Ornament so proper for the Church of God, as the Picture of *Jesus Christ*, Who planted it with His Blood? What in the next place, as the Pictures of *Saints*, who water'd it with theirs, and are now in their own Degree, the great Ornaments of the *Heavens*? What can be more powerful to excite us to a grateful Remembrance of the *Passion* of *Jesus Christ*, than to behold a *Crucifix* which represents Him to us, with Arms stretch'd out, as it were, to embrace us, and Hands, and Feet, and Side pierc'd for our Sins? What pious *Christian* can then abstain from expressing the Sense of his Heart, by some exterior Act of Honour and Respect to such a Representation, if not for its own, at least, for the sake of that, which it represents? And, as to the Ignorant, it cannot be deny'd, but that when they are taught, that such a Picture represents *Jesus Christ*, Who in that Posture sacrific'd Himself for their Sins; that such other Pictures represent the Apostles and *Saints*, who preach'd, and deliver'd that Faith and Religion to them, by which they are to be

eternally



*eternally* happy ; it cannot be deny'd, I say, but that such Lessons are easily retain'd, and create in their Minds a grateful Acknowledgement of the Mercies of their *Redeemer*, and a Desire to imitate the Vertue and Piety of the Saints. And then the Respect which they shew to these Pictures, is but the Natural Result of their Sense of the Benefits they receive by the *Passion* of *Christ*, and by the Piety and Charity of the Saints.

These were the chief Motives, that induc'd the Church in all Ages, to have, and to keep the Pictures of *Jesus Christ*, and His Saints. I say in all Ages *Eusebius* the Great and Famous Ecclesiastical Historian, who flourish'd in the Beginning of the Fourth Age, tells us, that the *Christians* had from the Beginning, the Pictures of *Christ*, and of *S. Peter* and *St. Paul* ; that he himself had seen the Statue, which the Woman, whom *Christ* had heal'd of the *Bloody Flux*, erected for Him at *Paneras* ; and that, at the Foot of this Statue, there grew an Herb, which when it touch'd the Skirt of the Statue, had a Virtue of curing Diseases. And *Helena's* Seeking and Finding the Cross, on which our Lord suffer'd, and the Miracle by which it was discover'd, are too well known to be question'd.

*Hist.*  
*Ecclef.*  
Lib. vii.  
Cap xviii  
edit. Vol.

But what need I insist upon Proofs of the Lawfulness of Pictures and Images in Churches, or of the Respect that is due to them, since the *Protestants* themselves acknowledge both. They say, they only exclaim against the Abuses committed in the *Church of Rome*, upon this account : But for the thing it self, they

they say; they willingly own it. This is the Declaration the ingenious Author of the *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, in answer to the *Bishop of Meaux*, makes in the Name of that Church. It may not be a-

Fig. 18. miss to subjoin his very Words: *We will honour*, says he, *the Relicks of the Saints, as the Primitive Church did: We will respect the Images of our Saviour, and the B. Virgin: And as some of us now bow towards the Altar, and all of us are enjoyn'd to do so, at the Name of Jesus; so will we not fail to testifie all due Respect to this Representation.* Now we do likewise declare, and have upon all Occasions done, that we neither mean, nor intend to give any more to the *Images of Christ*, or the *V. Mary*, or the *Saints*, but *due Honour and Respect*. But if neither the expresse Decree of the *Council of Trent*, which commands us to give them no more, nor the *Bishop of Meaux's* Exposition of our Doctrine, in which this is so manifestly declar'd, nor our own often repeated Protestations to that effect, will prevail upon them to believe us; all we can say is, that we are sorry for their Incredulity, but cannot help it. As to those Abuses, which this ingenious Man says have crept in upon account of *Images*: If there be any such, we protest and declare, that we abhor and detest them, no less than he, or any of his Persuasion; or to use the *Council of Trent's* Phrase, we earnestly desire, they shou'd be entirely abolish'd. But sure he was too reasonable to think, that the Abuse of a thing was a good Argument against the Use of it.

Nor

Nor will his Example of *Hezekiah's* Destroying the *Brazen Serpent* help the Matter: For he may please to consider, that the *Children of Israel* liv'd in a Country, where they were surrounded, and as I may say, hedg'd in, on every side, with Idolatry, and the Worship of False Gods; and not only so, but they themselves were very much given to that Worship, as appears by the Groves, and High Places, and Idols set up among them, by their wicked Kings and Rulers; and which this pious King pull'd down and destroy'd; and therefore is deservedly commended in *Scripture* for breaking in pieces the *Brazen Serpent*, to which the People, no doubt, sacrific'd. But, blessed be God, we have no such thing to fear: We have no *Idolaters* among us, nor near us; we have no *Groves* nor *High Places*, nor *Idols* in the Land. We do not burn Incense to any False Gods, nor worship them. We make only the *Images*, and *Pictures* of the True God, and His *Saints*; and it cannot be deny'd, but these same *Pictures* and *Images*, have been kept in our Churches, and have had the same Respect given them, which we now give, at least these 900 Years, and, in the Opinion of many Learned *Protestants*, for 400 Years before. Yet all this while no *Heathen Idolatry* was ever introduc'd into the Church, upon account of our *Images*: No Defection from *Christianity* to *Pagan Worship* was heard among us. So that the Example of *Hezekiah* is not to the purpose, the Parallel is not just, we are nothing concern'd in it. Besides, the



*Brazen Serpent* was a Monument of no such great Moment to be long preserv'd: 'Twas only kept, to put the *Children of Israel* in mind of the Miraculous Cure of those, who were bitten by the Serpents in the Wilderness; and when they left that Land and were no more vex'd by these Serpents, it was of no great use. But the Remembrance of the Death and *Passion* of our Lord, by Whom the Sins of the World was taken away, and of His Holy Apostles and Saints, by whom His Doctrine was propagated and transmitted to us, is of that high Importance and Concern to all the World, that these Monuments which put us in mind of them, ought to be for ever most carefully preserv'd.

Page. 14.

As to what he says, That in the *Hymns* for the Day of the *Invention of the Cross*, and *Good Friday*, we desire the Cross to strengthen the *Righteous*, and give pardon to the *Guilty*, &c. And that in the Service on *Good Friday* we say, *Behold the Wood of the Cross! Come, let us adore it.* I answer.

First, That Poetical *Hymns* and *Verses* have in all Writings, a greater Latitude than Prose.

Secondly, That these Expressions are *Apostrophes* and *Exclamations* address'd to *Jesus Christ* upon the Cross, Whom we represent to our Minds as there hanging, when we salute the Cross. And that this is our Meaning (whatever the Words may import upon any other Occasion) I think is plain, from the Words of the *Council of Trent*, which expressly forbids us to believe, that there is any Virtue or Divinity in *Images*, or to demand

mand any thing in them ; which if we believe (as we profess and declare we do) it cannot with any Colour of Reason, be presum'd, that we shou'd ask Strength or Pardon of the Wood of the Cross, contrary to the express Commands of the *Council*, and to the Faith, which we profess.

Touching the Words in the Service, on *Good Friday*: *Behold the Wood of the Cross! Come, let us adore it.* I am sorry to see so ingenious a Man, and who otherwise professes to be so great a Friend to Sincerity and Truth, swerve so manifestly from both, in this Point. He gives us here an *Anthem* sung on *Good Friday*, maim'd in the Middle, and added to, in the End. The Words in the *Roman Missal* are thus: *Ecce Lignum Crucis in quo Salus Mundi pependit ! Venite Adoremus. Behold the Wood of the Cross on which the Saviour of the World hung! Come, let us adore.* Here is no (*It*) as he adds. And sure, it is more reasonable, and more agreeable to Grammatical Construction, to refer the Word *Adore*, to *Saviour of the World*, which immediately goes before it, than to the *Wood of the Cross* which goes before that: And then the Sense is plainly this; *Behold the Wood of the Cross on which the Saviour of the World hung! Come, let us adore Him.* And that this, and no other, is the Sense, in which the *R. C. Church* takes these Words, I wonder any Man, that ever read the *Council of Trent* shou'd be ignorant of; seeing the Church, in that *Council*, has expressly declar'd, that by the Images, which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads and bow down, we adore

S 2

Christ

Christ and reverence the Saints. Here is a *Crucifix* propos'd to us, a Representation of *Jesus Christ* upon Mount *Calvary*; we kiss it, and bow to it; and when we say, *Come, let us adore*, we must surely mean, *Come, let us adore Christ*, else we shou'd contradict the exprefs Words of the *Council*. I own indeed, that we mean likewise by kissing the *Crucifix*, and bowing to it that Day, to give it due *Honour* and *Respect*; and that we make use of the Words, *Crucem adoremus*, several times on *Good Friday*, to exprefs the *Respect* we give it. But then we are warranted so to do by the *Scripture*, which uses the same Term to exprefs the *Honour* exhibited to several Creatures, as appears by these Texts, *Adorent te Filii Matris tue*; *Let thy Mothers Sons adore thee*, says *Isaac* to his Son *Jacob* Gen. xxvii. 29. *Et omnis Multitudo—inclinantes capita adoraverunt Dominum & Regem*; and all the Congregation—bowing their Heads, ador'd the Lord and the King, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. *Adorate Scabellum pedum ejus*, *Psal xcix*. *Adore ye His Footstool*. Here is Adoration with a witness, and all to one, given to meer Creatures; and tho' in all these Phrases, the very Term is used in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, as well as in the *Latin*, which the *Scripture* uses to exprefs the Supreme Adoration given to the True God; yet no Man ever said, that these Creatures ought to be ador'd in the strict Propriety of Adoration or Supreme Worship; but the Sense is, that they ought to be worship'd with the Honour and Respect, that is due to them. In like manner, tho' we say (in *Scripture*



ture Language) *Crucem adoramus*, we do not mean, nor intend to give the *Cross* any other Worship than that, which is due to a Type or Figure, which represents our Saviour and Redeemer to us. Thus much concerning this ingenious Man's Exceptions to Images. I now come to Dr. Tillotson's Objections.

And here his Difficulties are neither great, nor many in Number. Two things only I observe in his Sermons, that deserve some consideration. The First, " That Worshipping  
 " of Images is as point blank against the Second  
 " Command (He should have said the First) Commandment, as a deliberate and malicious  
 " Killing of a Man is against the Sixth; Fifth  
 " would have been more true. The Second,  
 " That to secure the People from discerning  
 " our Guilt in this Matter, we are put  
 " upon that shameful Shift (as he is pleas'd  
 " to term it) of leaving out the Second Commandment  
 " in our common Catechisms and  
 " Manuals; lest the People, seeing so plain  
 " a Law of God against so common a Practice  
 " of our Church, should upon that Discovery,  
 " have broken off from us.

As to the First, I answer: If he means by Worship, to give the *Supreme* Worship and Adoration to Images, which is due only to God, he is very much in the right, and I hope, shall never be contradicted by me. But if he understands by Worship, to give Images that Honour and Respect, which is due to things, that represent *Jesus Christ* and His Saints, he is contradicted by *Scripture*, by all Antiquity, and even by his own Church, as well

as by us. Now that we give *Images* no other Worship than the Latter, or that the Decrees of the Church enjoin no more, I think I have already sufficiently prov'd.

Touching the Second ; I answer, That we never left out any of God's *Commandments*, either in *Catechism*, or *Manual* ; and that that, which he says is left out (which yet is not the Second Commandment, but part of the First) is to be found in hundreds of *Manuals* and *Catechisms* in *England* it self. And at this time, I have upon my Table, a *Manual* and *Catechism*, wherein all, he says we left out are contain'd : The First bears this Title ; *A Manual of Prayers, and Christian Devotions* ; the Latter, *An Abridgment of Christian Doctrine with Proofs out of Scripture, &c.* The First Edition, printed, Anno. 1649. Now a Man that can dispense with his Conscience and Honour so far as to publish from Press and Pulpit, Untruths so easily discover'd, what Paradox may he not undertake to maintain ? 'Tis true, there are some *Manuals* and *Catechisms*, in which Ten Commandments are comprehended, as it were in so many *Verses* ; that Children, and People of weak Capacity may learn them with more ease : But in no *Manual* or *Catechism*, that pretends to give the Commandments, was ever the *Second Commandment* left out. That which he calls the *Second Commandment*, viz. *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, &c.* is undoubtedly part of the *First*, and only added to inculcate to a gross ignorant People, what they were to avoid, in consequence of the

One

One God, which the *First Commandment* obliges them to have: For 'tis evident, that in these Words, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me*, is necessarily imply'd, that they shou'd not make to themselves any *graven Images*, or *Idols* to worship them; which to do, were to have other Gods: And therefore these Two Negatives make but One Commandment: Unless the Dr. will have it, that it is a distinct Commandment from the First, because it begins a Verse, or contains some Words, which are not express'd in the First. But he may please to consider, that the *Law of Moses* was extant, at least 1000 Years, before it was digested into Verses, or that any Points were added to it; during which time there was nothing to distinguish one *Commandment* from another but the very Reason and Nature of the things commanded; and then since this, which the Dr. wou'd have to be the *Second Commandment*, is altogether of the same Nature with the *First*, and prohibits nothing but what the *First* prohibits, namely, *The having or worshiping more than One God*, we have all the reason in the World to conclude, that it is but one, and the same Commandment with the *First*. And thus all our Ancestours, and all the Ancients Comments upon this Chapter of *Moses*, at least, as many as I have seen, understood it; and even *Martin Luther* in those Books, which he wrote against the *Church of Rome*, makes but One Commandment of the Doctor's *First* and *Second*. But if he will have it, that it is a



## Of Purgatory.

distinct *Commandment*, because it has a distinct *Prohibition*, then it will follow, that we must have as many *Commandments* as we have distinct *Prohibitions* in that Chapter, besides the *Affirmative Precepts*; and then we shall have *Thirteen* or *Fourteen Commandments* at least. *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image*, must be the *Second*; *Thou shalt not bow down to them*, the *Third*; *Thou shalt not take the Name of thy Lord thy God in vain*, the *Fourth*; *Remember to keep holy the Sabbath-day*, the *Fifth*; *Thou shalt do no manner of Work*, the *Sixth*; and so on. But as the Dr. wou'd not, I suppose, allow of this *Distribution*, so he may please to give us leave to stick to the old *Ten Commandments*, in the same *Order* and *Manner* we receiv'd them from our *Ancestours* of *Blessed Memory*.

## CHAP. IX. Of Purgatory.

WHAT we hold, as of *Faith* concerning this *Point*, is thus declar'd by the *Council of Trent*: *That there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detain'd, are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, but especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Mass.*

Here the *Council* does not determine what sort of *Place Purgatory* is, or what manner of *Pain* *Souls* endure in it; nor whether they are purg'd by *material Fire*, or by other *Torments* or *Anguishes* of *Mind*; but is content to declare with the *Fathers*, that there is a *Place*, wherein *Souls* departed are detain'd, without entering upon curious and needless

needless Questions concerning the Manner, or Duration of the Pains they there suffer. In handling therefore this Argument, I shall endeavour to tread in the Steps of the Ancient *Fathers*, and follow the Pattern of this *Council*, waving all superfluous and needless Questions relating to this Subject; which that I may the more plainly and distinctly do, I shall proceed in this Method.

1. *I will endeavour to shew that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded in Scripture, as interpreted by the Ancient Fathers of the Church.*

2. *But more especially, that it is founded in the Practice observ'd in the Primitive Church, of Praying for the Dead.* This I take to be an unanswerable Argument; for if it appears, that the *Primitive Church* did pray for the Dead, that their Sins might be forgiven them, then it will necessarily follow, that they believ'd those Souls, they thus pray'd for, to be in a Place, where they might be help'd, and benefited by their Prayers. This is evident; for, if the *Primitive Church* were of opinion, that all Souls departed, did go strait to *Heaven*, or to *Hell*, it were vain and superfluous to pray for them. They knew, there was no getting of Souls out of *Hell*; for, *Out of Hell there is no Redemption*: And therefore it were in vain to attempt it. And it were superfluous to pray for the Souls in *Heaven*, for the Remission of their Sins: For, why shou'd they pray for that, which they knew they had no need of. So that, if they did pray for the Remission of Sins of Souls departed, the Consequence is inevitable

## Of Purgatory.

inevitable, that they did believe there was a *Third Place*, where some Souls were detain'd, and might be assisted by their Prayers, which is what we call *Purgatory*.

3. *I shall answer what Doctor Tillotson brings against this Point.*

1. *I shall endeavour to shew that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded in Scripture, as interpreted by the Ancient Fathers of the Church. To prove this Head, I will produce some Texts of Scripture, with the Readings of the Fathers upon them.* 1. *Agree with thine Adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: Lest at any time, the Adversary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt not come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost Farthing, Mat. v.*

Lib. De Anima. Cap. lviii. 25, 26. *Tertullian, a Father of the Second Age, reads thus upon this Text. Seeing we understand that Prison which the Gospel demonstrates, to be Places below; and the uttermost Farthing we interpret every small Fault there to be punish'd by the Delay of the Resurrection; no Man can doubt but the Soul may pay something in the Places below. S. Cyprian a Father of the Third Age: It is one thing to be cast into Prison, not to go out thence, till he pays the uttermost Farthing, another, presently to receive the Reward of Faith; one thing to be afflicted with long Pains for Sins to be mended and purged long with Fire, another to have purg'd all Sins by Sufferings. Here this Father, alluding to the foregoing Text, says, that some Souls are cast into Prison till they pay the uttermost Farthing;*

Epist. 52. ad Anton.



Farthing; that others immediately receive their Reward, that is *Heaven*. Some are afflicted and purg'd by Fire, in order to their Amendment, whilst others have purg'd all their Sins by Sufferings or Martyrdom; the very Language of the present *R. Catholick Church*. *St. Jerome*, a *Father* of the Fourth Age, who, for his extraordinary Learning and Knowledge in the *Scriptures*, was called *Magister Mundi*, *The Master of the World*, in his Comment upon the same Text, has these Words, *This is that which he says*, Thou shalt not go out of Prison till thou pay, even thy little Sins; There is then such a Prison, in this Great Master's Opinion.

Com-  
ment. in  
S. Mar.

2. Every Man's Work shall be made manifest; for the Day shall declare it, because it shall be reveal'd by Fire; and the Fire shall try every Man's Work of what sort it is. If any Man's Work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a Reward. If any Man's Work shall be burnt, he shall suffer Loss; but he himself shall be saved: Yet so as by Fire, 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15. *S. Ambrose*, or the Author of the Commentaries upon the Epistles of *S. Paul* annex'd to his Works, which the ablest Criticks do, with good reason, ascribe to *Hilary*, Deacon of the Church of Rome, and contemporary to *S. Ambrose*, speaks thus of this Passage; But when he (*S. Paul*) saith, Yet so as by Fire, he shews indeed, that he shall be saved; but yet shall suffer the Punishment of Fire; that being purg'd by Fire, he may be sav'd, and not tormented for ever, as the Infidels are, with Everlasting Fire. In Cap. iii. Epist. 1. ad Cor. *S. Gregory of Nisse*

## Of Purgatory.

is so plain and full upon this Subject, that no *R. Catholick* can at this Time speak plainer.

ἢ τὰ κατὰ τὴν παρούσαν Ζώνην διὰ προσευχῆς τε, καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐκκαθαρεύεις, ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἐνδένδε μετανάστασιν, διὰ τῆς τῷ καθαρσίου πυρὸς χανείας. *A Man is cleansed, says he, either in this present Life by Prayer and the Love of Wisdom, or after his Death by the Furnace of a Purging Fire. And a little after.*

μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον, γνῶς τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ πρὸς τὴν κακίαν διάφορον ἐν τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι μετεχειν τῆς Θεότητος μὴ τῷ καθαρσίου πυρὸς τὸν ἐμμιχθέντα τῇ φοχῇ ῥύπον ἀποκαθίστατος. *After his Departure out of the Body, knowing the Difference between Vertue and Vice, it is impossible to be Partakers of the Divinity, unless Purgatory Fire doth cleanse the Soul from the Spots that stick to it. Orat. pro Mortuis prope Fin.*

*S. Austin* speaks much to the same purpose: *Purge me* (O Lord) says he, in this Life, and make me such, as shall not need that Purifying Fire. And a little after he adds, He shall be saved, yet so as by Fire: And because it is said, He shall be saved, this Fire is condemn'd; yet it will be more grievous, than any thing that a Man can suffer in this Life. *Enar. in Psal, xxxvii.*

I might insist upon several other Passages of *S. Austin*, and bring more Texts of Scripture with the Sense of the Fathers upon them, with Respect to this Subject; but, I think what is here offer'd is sufficient to shew, that our Doctrine concerning Purgatory, is founded in Scripture; and that the Ancient Fathers did believe it to be so. I shall now proceed to shew.

2. That the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is founded in the Practice, observ'd in the Primitive Church, of praying for the Dead, for the Remission of Sins. This, as I said before, if made out, will plainly establish our *Tenet*: For, if the Primitive Church did pray for the Dead, for the Remission of their Sins; it follows necessarily, that they suppos'd them capable of being assisted by their Prayers; and consequently neither in *Heaven*, nor in *Hell*, but in a Third Place, which is what we believe, and call *Purgatory*.

Now, that the Primitive Church, and all succeeding Generations us'd to pray for the Dead, for the Remission of their Sins; no one Point in the *Christian Religion* is more universally attested. S. *Epiphanius* tells us, that *Aerius* was reputed an Heretick for denying the Lawfulness of it; and besides him, I do not find since *Christianity* began, till the Beginning of the Last Age, any One Single Person, that ever deny'd or question'd it. Never was there found any *Liturgy* without it; nothing so frequent in the *Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers*, as the Recommendation of it: In a word, there is not one Doctrine or Practice of the *Catholick Religion* deliver'd with so full, and unquestionable a Tradition; no not the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*, no nor the *Incarnation*, nor the Necessity of *Baptism*, nor even the Truth of the *Scriptures*. So that a Man may, as well, make an Apology for being a *Christian*, as for this. *Tertullian* tells us, that in his Days, they made Yearly Oblations for the Dead, and pray'd

Lib. de

Cor. Mi-

litis.

for



Lib. de *for their Souls. Eusebius, that all the Congregati-*  
 Monog. *on pray'd for the Soul of the Emperour Constan-*  
 de Vita *tine the Great. S. Austin, That it is not to be*  
 Const. Lib *denied, that the Souls of the Dead are eas'd by*  
 iv. C. lxxi. *the Piety of their living Friends, when the Sacri-*  
 In Enchir. *fice of the Mediator is offer'd for them. That*  
 Cap. cx. *his Mother Monica her last Injunctions to*  
 Lib. ix. *him was to remember her at the Altar. That*  
 Confes. *the Tradition of the Fathers is observ'd by the*  
 Cap. xiii. *whole Church, viz. That they shou'd pray for those*  
 Ser. xxxii *whody'd in the Communion of the Body and Blood*  
 de Verb. *of Christ, in that place of the Sacrifice, where the*  
 Apost. *Dead are recommended. In short, I shou'd ne-*  
*ver end, should I relate all the Sayings of*  
*Fathers, and Councils, and Ecclesiastical Wri-*  
*tters upon this Subject ; so that I may confi-*  
*dently affirm, there is not one Point in the*  
*Christian Religion more unanimously believ'd*  
*or more religiously practis'd over all the Ca-*  
*tholick Church, in all Ages, than this of pray-*  
*ing for the Dead, and offering the Sacrifice*  
*of the Mass for their Souls. And this is so*  
*well known, that no Sober and Learned Pro-*  
*testant ever yet deny'd the immemorial An-*  
*tiquity of it, at least, that ever I met with.*  
*But being sensible how necessarily, and ine-*  
*vitable the Belief of Purgatory, or a Third*  
*Place, where Souls are detain'd for a time,*  
*is consequent upon this Practice, they have*  
*recourse to certain Subterfuges and Evasi-*  
 Exposit. *ons. They tell us, that Prayers were made*  
 of the Do- *from the Second Age for the Apostles and*  
 ctrine of *Martyrs, and Confessours, and even for the*  
 the *Blessed Virgin Mary ; all which they thought*  
 Church *in Happiness, and never touch'd at Purgatory ;*  
 of Engl. *that*  
 Pag. 31.

that therefore it does not follow, there is a *Purgatory*; because they prayed for the Dead. To which I answer, that these Gentlemen wou'd very much oblige us, if they wou'd be so good, as to instance some of those Prayers, which they say were put up for the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*; which I never yet met with, in any of their Writings. And this very thing gives me a shrewd Suspicion, that they are not able to produce any Examples of that kind, at least, to the purpose, considering how liberal, and even prodigal, they are of Quotations of *Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers*, when they seem to make for them. this I am certain of, that the Primitive Church did only believe their Prayers available for those, whom they thought not to have so well lived, as that they shou'd not need their charitable Assistance. 'Tis what S. *Austin* says; *Pro Defunctis quibusdam Ecclesie exauditur Oratio, quorum in Christo regeneratorum, nec usq; adeo Vita in Corpore malè gestæ est, ut tali Misericordia judicentur digni non esse, nec usq; adeo benè, ut talem Misericordiam reperiantur necessariam non habere.* The Prayers of the Church are heard for such as are regenerated in Christ, whose Lives have not been altogether so bad, as not to be thought worthy of such a Mercy, nor altogether so good, as not to need such a Mercy. And the same Father tells us, that It were to injure the *Martyrs* to pray for them, to whose Prayers we ought rather to have ourselves commended.

But do not the ancient *Liturgies* make mention of Prayers and Thanksgivings put up to God for, or in honour of the *Apostles*,  
and

De Civit.  
vit. Dei,  
Lib. xxi.  
Cap. xxix

## Of Purgatory.

De En-  
chiridio  
ad Lau.  
Cap.

and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*? And does not the Roman *Missal*, we now use, do the same? Yes most certainly; for we pray to God, and thank Him for, and in Honour of the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*; and so did all Antiquity: But then these Prayers are not Intended for the Delivery of their Souls from any Pains, but to thank Almighty God for crowning the *Martyrs* and *Saints*; and to praise his Holy Name for bringing them to that happy State they now are in; as the *Prayers* and *Oblations* of the *Primitive Church*, and those we now make for the Souls of such as die in the Communion of the Church, of whose perfect Innocence and Holiness we are not assur'd; are intended to beg of God, that he wou'd be merciful to them, and forgive them those sins, for which they did not fully satisfy in this Life. And this *S. Austin* tells us was the Design and End of all the Prayers put up for the Dead, whether *Apostles* or *Martyrs*, or other Christian Souls. These are his Words: *The Oblations and Alms usually offer'd in the Church for all the Dead, who receiv'd Baptism, were Thanksgivings for such as were very Good, Propitiations for such as were not very Bad; but for such as were very wicked, tho' they gave no Relief to the Dead, yet were they some Consolation to the Living.* And is not this the very Doctrine we hold this Day? Do not we offer the *Sacrifice of Christ's Body*, as this *Father* calls it, on the *Feasts* of the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, &c. in thanksgiving to God for the Blessed Estate of the *Saints* in *Heaven*? And  
do



do not we pray, and give Alms and offer the same Sacrifice for the propitiation of those, whom we charitably believe to have died in the peace, and Communion of the Church? Does our praying to God for the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary*, as aforesaid, hinder us to believe, that there is a place wherein other Souls are detain'd till they have satisfied the Divine Justice? No sure: And why must the like Prayers hinder the *Primitive Church*, to believe the same? Nay rather does it not necessarily follow, that the *Primitive Church*, as well as we, did believe there was such a Place, because they put up Prayers to God for Pardon and Forgiveness of Sins, for such as they reasonably believ'd to have died in the *Communion of the Body of Christ* (as the Fathers speak) *but not so perfect, as that they shou'd not need their Prayers*; since it were both vain and superfluous to have pray'd for them upon this score, had they believ'd they were immediately receiv'd into *Heaven*, or thrust into *Hell*. This I am confident no Man of Sense can reasonably deny: So that it is a most shameful Evasion, to conclude, that the *Primitive Church* did not believe *Purgatory*, because they pray'd for the *Virgin Mary*, and the *Apostles* and *Martyrs*, &c. else why do they not conclude, that we do not believe it, because we do the same?

To sum up all these Evidences then, I reason thus: The *Primitive Church* pray'd to God for some Souls departed that they

T

might

## Of Purgatory.

might be deliver'd out of Prison; that their Faults, and Sins might be forgiven them; that they might be eas'd of their Pain; that they might be sav'd from the Punishment of Fire; that they might be receiv'd into *Heaven*; but such Prayers are inconsistent with a Belief, that the Souls departed are immediately taken into *Heaven*, or condemn'd to *Hell*. Therefore the Primitive Church believ'd there was a *Third Place*, wherein some Souls departed were detain'd, and were capable of being assisted and better'd by their Prayers.

The First Proposition is taken from the very Words of the Fathers, and acknowledg'd by our Adversaries to be true. The Second, a very small Portion of Natural Reason with never so little Insight in *Scripture*, and *Christian Religion* (which assures us that Prayers of that Nature, for those that are in *Heaven* or *Hell*, are needless and vain) will easily discover to be likewise true. And I think, the Consequence is rightly inferr'd; I now proceed to the Objections.

Vol. II.  
Pag. 63.

3. The Doctor objects first, " That the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is not founded in *Scripture*, nor can be prov'd from it; and that some of our own eminent Men do acknowledge it cannot. To which

I answer, that I have produc'd Two Passages from *Scripture*, and cou'd produce as many more, which the most eminent *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church* have interpreted of *Purgatory*, and therefore I think, I may safely tell the Dr. that, with Submission, he was mistaken. As to those eminent Men of our Church,

Church, who say, that the Doctrine of *Purgatory* cannot be prov'd from *Scripture*; when any one, in his behalf, names them, and points at the Place in their Works where they say so, I will return him as satisfactory an Answer as I can. In the mean time, I may reasonably presume, they say no such thing: Seeing he was never backward in giving Citations, when they made any thing for him. All the eminent Men, he vouches for this, is *Estius*, who, by the Doctor's own Confession, only says, that in his Opinion, the Passage of *S. Paul* above cited, does not evince *Purgatory*; but does not say, that other Passages of *Scripture* do not; and if he had, I shou'd oppose to his Opinion that of *Tertullian*, *St. Cyprian*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Jerome*, *St. Austin*, and many more of the Ancient Fathers, whose Authority in this Matter, ought I think, to weigh more with any reasonable Man, than that of any Modern Writer whatsoever.

His Second Objection is borrow'd from a Text in the *Revelations*: *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth: Ten saith the Spirit that they may rest from their Labours, and their Works do follow them*, Cap xiv.

13. " Here, says the Dr. the Spirit pro- Vol. II.  
 " nounces them happy who die in the Lord, edit. post  
 " because they rest from their Labours, Ob. Pag.  
 " which, adds he, they wou'd not do, were 307.  
 " they to be tormented in *Purgatory Fire*:  
 " *Ergo, &c.*

*Ans.* This Passage is confessedly obscure, as to the Meaning of some Words in it, and



## Of Purgatory.

the Time whence the Blessing there mention'd is to commence; and the Doctor's bestowing six full Pages, upon the Explication of it, shews it to be so; and for that Reason, I think it is against the Rules of Logick, to pretend to more Evidence in the Conclusion, than the Premises will afford. But it seems he forgot in his Second Sermon upon this Text, that in his First, he had told us, that the Dead, which die in the Lord, in *Scripture Phrase*, are those who die, or are put to death for the Lord's Cause, that is, as he expressly says, suffer *Martyrdom* for the Lord; I say, he must have forgot this, else he wou'd not have objected that Text against *Purgatory*; since he cou'd not be ignorant, that we believe, that all the *Martyrs*, who suffer for the *Faith* of *Christ*, and even other eminent Saints, who do not suffer *Martyrdom*; but live the Life of *Martyrs*, do rest from their Labours, and pass not thro' the Fire of *Purgatory*. Wherefore in my Opinion, he shou'd have given us another Interpretation of this Text, or have let *Purgatory* alone; but 'tis no new thing to find the Dr. pull down in one Place what he had built in another; and therefore I am not surpris'd to see *Purgatory* brought in by Head and Shoulders, and spoken against in *Season*, and out of *Season*. 'Tis *Purgatory* that reproaches the *Sacrileges*, and *Depredations* of the Doctor's Ancestours of worthy Memory. and bears hard upon their Posterity; and upon that account, it must be cry'd down, lest the horrid *Guilt* of the *Sacrileges* of the *Fathers*,

thers, shou'd fly in the Face of their Children, and give them that *Purgatory* in this Life, which, he wou'd perswade them, they shall not meet with in the next.

For a Third Objection, the Dr. tells us, *We have a very considerable, and substantial Reason to exempt as few, as possible we can, from going to Purgatory; because, says he, the more we put in fear of going thither, the Market of Indulgences (as he calls it) riseth the higher, and the profit thence accruing to the Pope's Coffers; and the more and greater Legacies will be left to the Priests, to hire their saying of Masses for the delivery of Souls out of the Place of Torments.*

Vol. II.

edit. post

obit. Pag.

310.

*Ans.* After my hearty thanks to the Dr. for his Charitable Opinion of us, I must observe, from what is above said, that, it seems, this *Market of Indulgences* is of a very long standing; and that the Ancient Fathers of the Church, took great care it shou'd not sink. But to be serious: 'Tis well known, and even acknowledg'd by the Learned of his Church, that in the time of *Gregory the Great*, now 1000 Years since, the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and all the Practices consequent upon it, were believ'd and us'd, as they are now. And did that Great Saint exempt as few as he cou'd from *Purgatory*, only to raise the *Market of Indulgences*? Did all the Bishops of the *Western Church*, nay, and of all the *World* concur with him in this, only to fill his Coffers? Alas! The Good Holy Man had but few Coffers, and as little Money to fill them with: Conversion of Souls,

not Money was his Business. Did St. *Austin* design the raising of the *Market of Indulgences*, or the putting of People into a Fear of going to *Purgatory*, when he earnestly desires the Readers of his *Confessions* to pray for his Mother *Monica's* Soul for the Remission of her Sins? And had S. *Jerome* any Thoughts of filling the *Pope's Coffers*, when he wrote, that much *Benefit* wou'd accrue to the Souls departed, by the Commemoration made of them in the venerable and dreadful *Mysteries*? For shame Doctor! Away with such *Unchristian* Scandals, and do not put us upon exposing your Credit and Character any further. But perhaps the *Legacies* left for the hiring of *Priests* (as he oddly phrases it) to say *Mass*, for the Delivery of Souls out of the Place of Torments, will mend the Matter. Indeed, if the *Priests* were allow'd to determine Matters of *Faith*, the thing (coming from the Doctor) wou'd not appear altogether so unreasonable; for, considering how very remarkable his Charity is to *Priests*, I do not question, he wou'd judge they wou'd deal well for themselves, had they but the handling of these Matters. But it is no less evident, that no simple Priest has ever yet had any Vote in declaring Matters of *Faith*, than that no other is hired (as he calls it) or will receive any Money for saying *Masses* for the Living, or the Dead, but the poorer, or more indigent sort of *Priests*, who have not a sufficient Patrimony, or Maintenance to subsist without it. And the Matter being undeniably so; where is the Conscience in saying, that the

*Councils*



*Councils* and *Prelates* of the Church, shou'd possess the People with the *Fear of Purgatory*, only to oblige them to hire some indigent *Priests* to say Mass for their Souls? But the Scandal is so gross and palpable, that the best answer I can make it is to condemn it.

The Dr. has some two, or three Objections more upon this Subject; but they are either solv'd in the Proofs brought for this Point, or co-incident with those Objections already spoken to, or else have no particular Difficulty: And so I take leave of him for this time.

## CHAP. X.

## Of Indulgences.

THE Power of *Indulgences* is founded in the Power of the *Keys*, wherewith *Jesus Christ* was pleas'd to intrust the Pastors and Governours of the Church; by which Emblem of *Keys*, is denoted the Power of opening and shutting the Kingdom of *Heaven*; of letting in, and keeping out, as *Christians* shall be found worthy, of the one, or the other. This Power is promis'd to *S. Peter*, in a special Manner, and in his Person to all his Lawful Successours, in these Words: *I say unto thee, that thou art Peter (i. e. A Rock) and upon this Rock I will build My Church; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven, Mat. xvi. 18, 19.* Again, the Promise of binding and loosing is made, in another

ther Place, to all the *Apostles*, in the same Words: *Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: And whatsoever ye loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven, Mat. xviii. 18.* And *Christ*, a little before His Ascension, actually conferr'd this Power upon them, and told them wherein it consists. *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose-soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose-soever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd. Joa. xx. 22, 23.* So that the Power of the *Keys* consists in remitting of Sins, and retaining them; that is, in loosing Men from those Bands of Iniquity wherewith they tye themselves, and in binding them up, or keeping them bound, till they have satisfied for their Sins, according to the Rules prescrib'd for that purpose. In a word, in opening the Gates of the Kingdom of *Heaven*, and letting some in, and in shutting the same, and excluding others, as they shall be found to have deserv'd it.

But, whereas our *Blessed Saviour* did not intend, that the *Apostles*, and their Successors shou'd bind Sinners so, as finally to exclude them from the Kingdom of *Heaven*, but only to keep them under Discipline for a time, till they had fulfill'd the Terms of the Covenant upon which He offers them *Salvation*; which consists in Obedience to His Laws, in Repentance and Satisfaction for their Sins, and Amendment of Life for the time to come; so the Church in all Ages never retain'd the Sins of Men for any other End, than to keep them in a wholesome and

and saving Discipline, till by penitential and laborious Works, they had given Marks of their Sorrow and Repentance, in proportion to the Greatness of their Sins. And as the *Apostles* and their *Successors* are commission'd by *Christ* to retain Sins, so likewise are they to loose them: And therefore may remit, abate, or alter these penitential and laborious Works, as their Prudence and Wisdom shall judge it most expedient.

Now *Indulgence* is nothing else but a Relaxation, or Remission of some part of (or all) these penitential Works to which a Sinner is liable by the *Canons* of the Church; which Remission is granted by the Pastors, but especially by the *Chief Pastor* of the Church, upon some weighty Considerations, for the greater Benefit and Advantage of the Faithful in general: Which that we may the better understand, it will be requisite to lay open some part of the Discipline of the *Primitive Church* with respect to this Matter.

We have 50 *Canons*, that go under the Name of the *Apostles*, which, if not of them, are undoubtedly of some *Apostolical Bishops* of the First or Second Age, their Use and Authority being very great since that time. We have likewise the *Canons* of several *Provincial Councils* of the Third and Fourth Age, which have been in great esteem and veneration among the Ancients; and for the pure and wholesome Discipline contain'd in them, have been inserted in the *Codex Canonum*, or *Book of Canons* of the *Universal Church*, as the Ancient Writers term it. These Ca-



*nons*, among other Matters of Discipline, prescribe the different Penances, which were to be impos'd upon Sinners in proportion to the Greatness of their Sins; whence came the Name of *Penitential Canons*, so famous in Antiquity. Some Canons prescribe Seven Years Penance to certain Sins; others, Eight Years to other Sins; some prescribe Ten Years, some Fifteen, some to the Hour of Death. Some Penitents, by Order of these Canons, fasted Three Days every Week, during the time of their Penance; using no other Sustenance, during that time, but Bread and Water; others stood cover'd with Sackcloth at the Church Doors *sub Die*, in the open Air, on *Sundays* and *Festivals*, while their Penance lasted; others stood within Doors cloathed in the same Raiment, weeping and lamenting their Sins; some lay prostrate upon the Floor begging and praying their Brethren to intercede for them; others were admitted to hear Divine Service, in the Weeds of Penitents after they had gone thro' the fore-mention'd *Stations*; whence the Names of *Hyemantes*, *Flentes*, *Prostrati*, *Audientes*, so often mention'd in the Canons.

Now these rigorous Penances (very rigorous I am sure they wou'd appear in our days) or *Exomologeses*, as some of the Fathers call them, were sometimes abated and remitted, partly upon account of the Fervour of the Penitents, who, before they had gone thro' all their *Stations*, gave such Marks of sincere Repentance, that to encourage o-  
thers

thers to follow their Examples, they were admitted to the Communion and Fellowship of the Faithful, tho' they had not compleated the Time prescrib'd by the Canons; partly, but more especially, at the Intercession of the *Martyrs*: For when any *Martyrs* were to be executed, and had begg'd of the Bishops to indulge those Penitents, whom they recommended to them; the Bishops, who cou'd not in reason, refuse any thing in their power, to Men, who were ready to lay down their Lives, and shed their Blood for the *Christian Faith*, did commonly grant their Requests. And this the Fathers call (as in very deed it is) *Indulgence*.

It were endless to instance in all the Examples, which might be brought from the *Fathers* of the Second and Third Age upon this Subject. *S. Cyprian* is most remarkable in this Business. We have several of his Epistles wherein he tells us, that having very often granted *Indulgence* to Penitents, at the request of *Martyrs*, he was forc'd at last (being too much importun'd for People, who did not deserve that Favour, to write to the *Martyrs* themselves, to beg of them, that they wou'd not recommend, but such as were worthy of that Grace; at least, that they shou'd not take it ill, if he shou'd not grant their Request; lest the Discipline of the Church shou'd be enervated upon that score. The same *Father* complains in his Letters to the Clergy of *Rome*, and to others, that some of his own Priests, in his absence, had presum'd to give *Indulgences*, which the  
Bishops

Bishops only cou'd do. In short, there is nothing more frequently mention'd both by *Fathers*, and *Ecclesiastical Writers*, or more universally practis'd for the Four First Ages, than these *Indulgences*.

Now the *Roman Catholick Church* neither means by *Indulgences*, nor pretends to any more than the same Power, which the *Primitive Fathers* both had and practis'd; that is, of dispensing with, or remitting the Penances prescrib'd by the Canons; nor did she ever pretend to dispense with any Man from Repentance for Sins, or Obedience to the Law of God. On the contrary, the *Roman Catholick Church* teaches, and has always taught, that all the *Indulgences* in the World do signify nothing, without a hearty Contrition and sincere Sorrow for Sin, which is the Spirit and Essence of *Christian Devotion*. But Canonical Penances being meerly of Ecclesiastical Institution, and pertaining to Discipline, it cannot be deny'd, but that the Church has power to intend, or remit them, according to the different Circumstances of Time, Place, and Persons; especially since *Christ* Himself has given her power to remit and retain Sins, in which Power this Relaxation is manifestly imply'd.

'Tis true, the *Roman Catholick Church* does not now impose such rigorous Penances upon Sinners, as the *Primitive Church* did. Nor does she expose them publickly in the Church in *Penitential Weeds*, as was practis'd in the *Primitive Times*; but then the reason on't is, because no body now wou'd undertake these



these Penances; because she is convinc'd, that Men wou'd sooner break off with *Christ*, and turn *Heathens*, than purchase *Heaven* at so dear a Rate: So far has Wickedness and Dissolution prevail'd in the World:

In the Infancy of the Church, Piety, Devotion, Mortification, Austerity, were lovely things: *Christians* affected them very much of themselves, and therefore readily undertook them, when they had the misfortune to fall into any grievous Sin. Besides, they had before their eyes frequent Examples of the Constancy and Resolution of their Pastors. They saw them expose their Lives with the greatest Contempt of the World, and bear the Torments of *Racks*, *Gridirons*, *Wheels*, and other *Hellish* Instruments (Episcopacy in those Days being but One Remove from *Martyrdom*) with as much Cheerfulness, and as little Concern, as if these cruel Engines had been *Bays* and *Laurels*; and therefore it is not to be admir'd, that the Blood of *Martyrs*, then reeking hot, shou'd warm their Inclinations to Sufferings and Mortification; and stir them up to a Contempt of the Allurements and Pleasures of a wicked World, not knowing how soon they themselves shou'd be call'd to the like *Fiery Trial*. But no sooner did the Blood of *Martyrs* grow cold, and the Terrours of Death were taken away, by the Peace and Quiet, which *Constantine the Great* restor'd to the Church; when the Primitive Piety and Devotion began to decay, and *Christians* multiply'd their Sins, as they did their Riches. No sooner were the Sanguinary

nary Laws, and Cruel Edicts of *Pagan Emperours* repeal'd, and *Christians* put in possession of great Fortunes, and promoted to Honours and Dignities, when they forgot their former Condition, wax'd wanton against *Christ*, and spurn'd at Discipline. So that, in a few Ages after, you might as well expect *Grapes* from *Thorns*, or *Figs* from *Thistles*, as the Primitive Penances from Modern *Christians*: And therefore it was necessary to mitigate the Severity of that Discipline, lest the generality of (I may say all) *Christians* shou'd throw off all Care of their *Salvation*, and either return to Pagan Idolatry, or follow the Delusions of their own Fancies.

However, since the Apostles, and Apostolical Bishops (whose Conduct ought to be the Rule and Measure of all future Ages) have prescrib'd, and declar'd what Penances ought to be impos'd upon Sinners, according to the degree of their Sins; the Church hath always taught, that all *Christians*, who have been or are so unfortunate as to fall into grievous Sins, are still liable to these Penances, unless they are dispens'd with by the Church, or *commuted* for some other Works of Piety. And, that the Discipline of the Church, might be preserv'd and upheld, as much as the Wickedness of the Times will bear, all Pastors and Confessours are commanded to impose such Penances upon Sinners as will bear some proportion with the Greatness of their Sins, tho' not to that degree as the Primitive Canons require, leaving the rest to be dispens'd with, or indulg'd by the

the *Chief Pastors* of the Church, according to the Power which *Christ* has given them, and as General Councils have determin'd. And this, in as few Words as I cou'd well deliver it, is truly and plainly the Case of *Indulgences*; and the reason, why they are so often given, is the great Decay of Piety and Devotion in *Christians*, and the tender Affection of the Church for their *Eternal Welfare*; not a Desire of Money, or any filthy Lucre, as our Adversaries do most unjustly suggest. On the contrary, I am confident that there is not one Divine or Casuist in our Church, who does not hold, that it is Sinful and Diabolical, even the Sin of *Simon Magus*, to give, or receive any Money for *Indulgences*. And several General Councils and Popes Decrees have expressly declar'd that to give, or receive any sort of Gift, either directly, or indirectly, for either *Indulgences*, or any other Spiritual Grace is perfect *Simony*; which, surely, is sufficient to justifie us from any sinister dealing in this particular.

As to the Abuses of *Indulgences*, which I do not deny to have sometimes happen'd; we are so far from countenancing, or abetting them, that it is our earnest Wishes, and the Desire of our Hearts, that all such shou'd be entirely abolish'd and taken away. We covet no more, than that all *Christians* in time of Jubilees, and Plenary *Indulgences*; shou'd think on their ways in the Bitterness of their Souls; shou'd repent, and be sorry for their Sins; shou'd have a strong Hope and Confidence in the Mercy of Almighty God; give Alms to  
the



the Poor, and by their earnest and fervent Prayers, dispose themselves, through God's Grace, to receive the *Indulgence*, or Remission of those Canonical Penances, which, neither the Condition of the Persons, nor the Wickedness of the Times, nor yet the great Decay of Piety will permit us to require they shou'd fully perform. And this we do; because we find the same thing practis'd in the best and purest Times of *Christianity*, even in the *First, Second, Third, and Fourth Ages*; especially, being warranted by the Word of God, Who gave to His Church the Power of remitting and retaining Sins.

And now, having found nothing in Dr. *Tillotson's* Sermons upon this Subject, that requires any particular Consideration, besides what is here explain'd; I shall conclude this *Treatise* with my hearty Prayers to the *Father of Light*, that He wou'd be mercifully pleas'd to open the Eyes of our Adversaries, that they may see the Innocence, and Reasonableness of our Doctrine; and give them the *Grace* to lay seriously to Heart, how dangerous 'it is to reject those things, which the *Catholick Church* declares to have been deliver'd by *Christ* and His *Apostles*. Our, and their *Creed* says, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*: And they own, that the *Catholick Church*, before the *Reformation*, did hold and declare those things, wherein we differ from them, to be Truths deliver'd by *Christ* and His *Apostles*: How then can they *believe the Catholick Church*, when she declares these things, if they do not hold and *believe the things themselves*?

selves? Or how can they in reason reject them, if they *believe the Catholick Church*, which tells them, they are Divine Truths?

But there is yet something more desperate, which I beg of Almighty God to give them the *Grace* to consider. Our *Saviour* saith to His Apostles: *Go, and teach all Nations, Baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, Mat. C. xxviii. 19, 20.* And St. Mark adds: *He that believeth, and is Baptis'd, shall be sav'd; but he that believeth not, shall be damn'd. Cap. xvi. 16.* Now if those things which make the Subject of our Dispute, be Truths given in charge to the Apostles, then our Adversaries are (to my great Grief I must say it) lost for ever: For it is not enough, according to *Christ's* own Words, to believe in the *Trinity*, to believe the *Incarnation*, to believe in the *Holy Ghost*, to believe *Baptism*, the *Eucharist*, &c. but we must believe *all things whatsoever Christ* commanded, and that on pain of *Damnation*. But if it shou'd happen (as no doubt it cannot) that the Points in dispute, were not commanded by *Christ* or His Apostles, where is the Harm in believing them, since we are commanded to do so by the Church, which our *Creed* tells us we must believe?

*Christ* our *Saviour* doth often reproach the *Jews* for their Incredulity, and the *Scripture*, in several Places, gives us an account of the Punishment of such as wou'd not believe the Messengers sent by God to declare His Will

Mat.  
xiv. 28.

to them: But we do not find, that ever He reproach'd any body for having too much Faith, especially when the things to be believ'd, were declar'd to them, by the Messengers of God, which sure, the *Bishops* and *Priests* of the Church are: On the contrary, we read in the *Scripture*, that *Christ* has, upon several Occasions, highly commended and extoll'd Mens Readiness to believe. O *Woman*, great is thy Faith! Where lies then the Harm of believing *Transubstantiation*, or the *Real Presence*, which are so plainly deliver'd in *Scripture*? Where is the Harm of allowing due Honour and Respect to be given to *Saints*, and of desiring them to pray for us, since it is what we do, and are commanded to do to one another in this Life? If they hear our Prayers, and intercede for us, well and good: But if they do not, what do we lose by it? Where is the Harm in praying for our deceas'd Friends? Sure we do but declare our pious Affections to them, tho' our Prayers had done them no good. And where is the Harm in all this? How can it hurt any body to believe that the Church hath power to give *Indulgences*, that is, to remit all, or part of the Temporal Punishment due for Sins; since it is plainly express'd in *Scripture*, that *Christ* gave to His *Apostles*, and the *Apostles* to their Successours, the Power of *remitting*, and *retaining* Sins; and that *whatsoever they loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*? How can this hurt any body, I say, or where lies the Hazard in believing those things, tho' we had

not



not as much Assurance of their being Divine things, as of other things, since they are not contrary to any other *Article* of our *Faith*, nor to Right Reason, or Good Manners? But there is infinite Hazard in not believing them, since they have been declar'd by the Church, which our *Creed* and the *Scripture* command us to believe and hear, on pain of being reputed *Heathens* and *Publicans*.

Now that they are Divine Truths (besides what is already offer'd to prove each Point in particular) we have all the *Eastern Churches* on our side. All the *Greek Church*, together with the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, the *Christians of St. Thomas*; in a word, all the Oriental Sects of what Denomination soever. do practise and believe *Transubstantiation*, the *Real Presence*, the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, *Seven Sacraments*, the Use of the *Liturgy*, in a Tongue which the Common People do not understand, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Relicks* and *Images*, and *Prayers for the Dead*. See the *Critical History* of the Learned Father *Simon*, *Of the Religion and Customs of the Eastern Churches*: 'Tis done into *English*, printed in *London*, and very much esteem'd by the Learned. Seeing then, the *Latin Church*, which together with the *Greek* and other *Eastern Churches*, make up the whole Body of the *Christian World*; and that all these Churches did hold and profess the said Doctrine, when the *Reformation* began, and do still hold and believe the same; I think, I may confidently affirm, that it is *Catholick* and *Orthodox*.

*I shall therefore once more, beg of Almighty God, thro' the Merits of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ; and by that Blood, Which was shed for our Redemption, that He wou'd please in His Mercy to soften the Hearts of our Adversaries, and give them grace to entertain Thoughts of Peace of His Holy Church, from which they have so long gone astray: To the end, that they and we may with one Heart, and one Tongue praise and magnifie His Holy Name all the Days of our Lives; and when it shall please his Infinite Goodness to call us to Himself, that we may meet together at the Resurrection of the Just; thro' the Merits of the Death and Passion of our only Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ, to Whom, with the Father and Holy Ghost, be Honour and Glory now, and for ever. Amen.*

6 NO 63

FINIS.

